DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 458 UD 016 838

TITLE	Evaluation of Selected New York City Umbrella Programs, 1974-1975 School Year.
INSTITUTION	Fordham Univ., Bronx, N.Y. Inst. for Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	Jul 75
NOTE	144p.; New York City Board of Education Function Numbers: 20-53402, 20-53406, 20-53407, 20-53408, 20-53409, 20-53410, 20-53411, 20-53412, 20-53413, 20-53414, 20-53417, 20-53418
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; Diagnostic Teaching; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); *Mathematics Instruction; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Programs; *Reading Skills; Social Studies; Tutorial Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*New York (New York); Umbrella Projects

ABSTRACT

An evaluation of twelve different New York City Umbrella Programs coordinated in New York City public schools during the 1974-1975 school year is contained in this document. This report presents a description and evaluation of these programs, together with the major findings. The programs were implemented in the following areas: (1) tutoring in Harlem, (2) social studies, (3) reading and mathematics, (4) bilingual tutoring and instruction to immigrant children, (5) teacher training and instructional innovation in reading and other curriculum areas, (6) instructing students on the adverse effects of venereal disease, cancer, alcoholism, narcotics abuse, and other health problems, (7) bilingual and bicultural education to Spanish speaking children, and (8) diagnostic and prescriptive reading instruction. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

20-53402 to 20-53418

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Jonathan G. Messerli, Dean

ED137458

EVALUATION OF SELECTED
NEW YORK CITY UMBRELLA PROGRAMS
1974 - 1975 SCHOOL YEAR

Function Numbers

20-53402
20-53406
20-53407
20-53408
20-53409
20-53410
20-53411
20-53412
20-53413
20-53414
20-53417
20-53418

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

An evaluation of selected New York City Umbrella Programs funded under a Special Grant of the New York State Legislature performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1974-1975 school year.

UD016838

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
REGIS G. BERNHARDT, DIRECTOR
JULY, 1975

EVALUATION OF SELECTED
NEW YORK CITY UMBRELLA PROGRAMS
1974 - 1975 SCHOOL YEAR

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Harlem Education Tutoring Program (F.N.20-53402)

I. Program Description 1
II. Program Implementation 2
III. Evaluation Design 3
IV. Program Effectiveness 4
V. Program Strengths and Weaknesses 5
VI. Recommendations 6

School Community Neighborhood Center (F.N. 20-53406)

I. Program Description 8
II. Program Implementation 9
III. Evaluation Design 11
IV. Program Effectiveness 11
V. Program Strengths and Weaknesses 14
VI. Recommendations 14

Richmondtown Restoration Education Project (F.N. 20-53407)

I. Introduction 16
II. Objectives and Evaluation Design 17
III. Program Implementation 17
IV. Program Effectiveness 23
V. Program Strengths and Weaknesses 24
VI. Recommendations 25
VII. Summary 26

School Community Neighborhood Centers: Parent-Child Orientation Program (F. No. 20-53408)

I. Introduction 27
II. Objectives and Evaluation 28
III. Program Implementation 29
IV. Program Effectiveness 33
V. Program Strengths and Weaknesses 37
VI. Recommendations 38

Page

Walk and Talk Program (F. No. 20-53409)

I. The Program 39
II. Evaluation Procedures 40
III. Findings 41
IV. Recommendations 48

Teacher Training and Instructional Innovation in Reading and Other Curriculum Areas (F. No. 20-53410)

I. Introduction 50
II. Program Evaluation 50
III. Program Implementation 51
IV. Program Effectiveness 52
V. Recommendations 57
VI. Summary 58

Education in Action (F. No. 20-53411)

I. Introduction 59
II. Evaluation Design 60
III. Program Implementation 61
IV. Program Effectiveness 64
V. Program Strengths and Weaknesses 69
VI. Recommendations 70

Bilingual-Bicultural Program (F. No. 20-53412)

I. Introduction 72
II. Evaluation Design 73
III. Program Implementation 74
IV. Program Effectiveness 76
V. Program Strengths and Weaknesses 81
VI. Recommendations 82
Appendix 84

Help Neighborhood Center Program (F. No. 20-53413)

I. Introduction 86
II. Evaluation Design 87
III. Program Implementation 88
IV. Program Effectiveness 90
V. Program Strengths 96
VI. Recommendations 96

Student Progress Reporter Corps (F. No. 20-53414)

I. Introduction 98
II. Evaluation Design 99
III. Program Implementation 100
IV. Program Effectiveness 107
V. Strengths and Weaknesses of the Program 110
VI. Recommendations 111

Page

Children Learn To Read Through Cooperative Teaching Of Paraprofessionals and Teachers (F. No. 20-53417)

I. Introduction 113
II. Program Evaluation 114
III. Program Implementation 115
IV. Program Effectiveness 119
V. Program Strengths and Weaknesses 124
VI. Recommendations 125

Diagnostic-Prescriptive Reading Services - P.S. 40, Queens (F. No. 20-53418)

I. Introduction 127
II. Objectives and Evaluation Design 128
III. Program Implementation 129
IV. Program Strengths and Weaknesses 135
V. Recommendations 136
VI. Summary 137

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Final Report
July, 1975

Function No. 20-53402

EVALUATION OF CITY-WIDE UMBRELLA PROGRAMS

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

1974 - 1975 SCHOOL YEAR

"HARLEM EDUCATION TUTORING PROGRAM"

Prepared by: Jerome A. Contee

I. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This tutoring program was specifically designed to raise the scholastic achievement level of selected participants, particularly in the basic skills areas of reading and mathematics. Identified by means of the Metropolitan Achievement Test as being two or more years behind their normative level in reading and mathematics, the participants lived in Central Harlem, were between the ages of 6-13 and ranged in grade level from 1-9.

The "Harlem Education Tutoring Program" was a functional component of a non-profit agency that has had a rich history in Central Harlem. Founded in July, 1962, the Harlem Education Program, Inc. (HEP) is a community based program in that the Board of Directors, the Advisory Committee and the office staff are composed of neighborhood residents. With offices located in a storefront at 313 West 145th Street, HEP operated the tutorial program plus a counseling and referral unit. The Board of Directors felt that, taken together, the tutorial, counseling and referral services constitute a comprehensive program that addressed itself to the educational and life support needs of both the tutees and their families.

Tutors for the tutorial component were recruited from New York City colleges and local high schools. Referrals to the program were made by guidance counselors, teachers, social workers, courts and parents. Tutees were referred from seven schools in the Central Harlem area.

II. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The tutorial component utilized the service of one senior school neighborhood worker, one teacher, one parent program assistant, two educational assistants and eleven student aides.

Prospective participants (tutees) and their parents were interviewed at the program site and after they were accepted, a tutor was assigned to meet with the student two days a week for two hours each session. A unique aspect of the program was that tutoring sessions took place in the student's home.

Using the results of the Metropolitan Achievement tests as a base, student needs were assessed and the tutor, in consultation with the student, the student's teacher, the program teacher, and the parents, established a remedial program. Basic mathematics skills, reading, comprehension, vocabulary building, and study skills were the focus of most sessions.

The tutorial component teacher was directly responsible for tutor assignments. One day per week (Friday, 4 hours), the tutors held a meeting which included both in-service training workshops and individual counseling sessions under the teacher's supervision. At those meetings, the teacher generally reviewed each tutor's work (including tutee progress) from the previous week, gave technical assistance in special problem areas and supervised the preparation of tutorial lesson plans for the next week. Also, the teacher and tutors discussed problems with the tutee and/or the family, the applicability of specific tutoring materials and new teaching techniques.

In addition to the weekly meeting, each tutor received an on-site visit from the supervising teacher on a rotating basis. These visits by the teacher in the tutees' homes lasted approximately one-half hour. Besides building relationships between the client and the agency, they also served a diagnostic and evaluative purpose.

III. EVALUATION DESIGN

In order to determine the degree to which the Harlem Education Tutoring Program met its objective of raising the scholastic achievement level of selected participants in the basic skills areas of reading and math, the following evaluation procedures were employed:

1. Parent Survey

A three-page parent survey was given to selected parents to ascertain their perceptions of the tutoring program.

2. Standardized Test Scores

As a measure of the tutorial program's effectiveness the Spring 1974 reading subtest of the MAT (grade equivalent) was utilized as a pre-test score and the Spring 1975 reading comprehension subtest of the 1975 New York City public school standardized test (grade equivalent) was utilized as a post-test score.

Historical regression procedures were utilized to determine predicted post-test scores for pupils in grades 4 through 8. The correlated _t_ test was applied to test the significance of differences between predicted and observed post-test scores for children in these grades. Grades 2-3, 4-6, and 7-8 were combined because of low numbers in the separate grades.

The historical regression was not applicable to grade 2 and there were only three students in grade 3.

IV. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Program effectiveness was determined by analyzing the results of the evaluative procedures that were employed. Table 1 indicates a percentage rating for yes responses. Results from the Parent Survey indicate that those parents surveyed gave generally positive feedback in regards to the ten yes-no response questions.

Table 1

Parent Survey: Yes/No Response Questions

Questions	% Rating for Yes Responses (N=30)
1. Does your child like tutoring?	90%
2. Does your child talk about school?	83%
3. Does your child talk about tutoring?	93%
4. Does your child want to continue tutoring?	90%
5. Has your child's behavior changed for the better since being in the program?	83%
6. Do you feel positively about your child being tutored?	93%
7. Do you feel your child has learned something?	90%
8. Do you feel your child does better in school since being tutored?	83%
9. Have you expressed feelings about the program to program personnel?	80%
10. Did they listen to what you had to say?	80%

The pre-test MAT scores were used to determine expected post-test achievement scores. Table 2 indicates the results of the comparison of the reading achievement scores. The observed post-test scores demonstrated that there were significant gains in reading achievement for grades 2-3, however, grades 4-6 demonstrated a decline from the pre-test to the post-test scores. Also in grades 4-6 the observed post-test was significantly less than the predicted post-test. Finally, grades 7-8 demonstrated a gain in reading achievement but there was no significant difference between predicted post-test and observed post-test scores.

Table 2

Comparison of Reading Achievement Scores of Participants in the Harlem Education Tutoring Program

		Pretest		Predicted Posttest		Observed Posttest		
Grade	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
2-3	11	2.02	.63	NA		2.24	.48	2.61*
4-6	24	3.46	.94	3.98	1.08	3.32	.75	-4.33*
7-8	9	4.49	1.28	4.91	1.42	5.21	1.35	1.33

NOTE: The Observed Posttest Mean was significantly less than the Predicted Posttest mean for Grade 4-6.

*Significant at .01 level

V. PROGRAM STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

The following strengths and weaknesses were noted:

Strengths

By far, the program's greatest strength was its comprehensive community based service orientation. The staff viewed each program component (tutorial, counseling and referral) as interlocking in regards to helping the target population acquire basic educational skills (tutorial component) and daily life support skills (counseling and referral).

Some specific strengths were:

1. Besides tutorial services, the program offered counseling and referral services to both tutees and their parents in the areas of housing, welfare, employment, health, consumer education, job training and child care.

2. The agency established a direct reciprocal referral relation-

ship with more than fifteen agencies in Central Harlem and Manhattan.

3. The home factor was stressed, in that the tutor provided the service within the tutee's home setting.

4. The program was community-based. That is, the program's Board of Directors, the program administrators, the clients and the building site were located within the Central Harlem community.

5. The program stressed parent involvement. The tutees were serviced as members of a family unit and parents were kept informed of the fact that the program also offered services to meet their needs.

Weaknesses

1. The program lacked an on-site well-equipped classroom type facility for the in-service training aspect of the tutorial component.

2. Referrals to the tutorial program far outnumbered the open slots available.

3. Because of the number of tutees, the supervising teacher could not develop a regular visitation schedule involving frequent visits.

4. The number of meetings between the tutor and the tutee's regular classroom teacher were not of sufficient number to provide for optimum articulation between the tutorial and school programs.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The tutorial component should be expanded. This could be done with the addition of more tutors and possibly with the half-time assistance of another supervising teacher. The half-time teacher would also allow the supervising teacher more time to engage in routine home visitation.

2. Evaluative survey forms should be developed for assessing the impact of the program on tutees and parents.

3. An on-site classroom facility with necessary equipment could help improve both program efficiency and quality. Such a facility would be multi-purposed, in that the supervising teacher and the tutors could use it both for in-service training and as an alternate tutoring site.

This recommendation is contingent upon the availability of a school during the evening hours that could accomodate the tutorial program. The cost of keeping such a school open must also be considered.

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Final Report
July, 1975

Function No. 20-53406

EVALUATION OF CITY-WIDE UMBRELLA PROGRAMS

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

1974 - 1975 SCHOOL YEAR

"SCHOOL-COMMUNITY NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER"

Prepared by: Jerome A. Contee

I. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The objectives of the School-Community program were twofold:

1. To orient and train District 5 parents in order that they may have a first hand knowledge of the Central Board of Education, the local Board of Education, school personnel, school regulations and operational procedures.

2. To provide tutorial services for students who were in need of assistance in acquiring basic skills in reading and arithmetic.

The program's rationale was centered around the belief that many District 5 parents feel alienated from their children's schools, have no overt lines of communication with school personnel and have no clear idea of how to ascertain their children's progress in school. At the same time New York City Board of Education data indicated that District 5 students were far below the national norm in reading and mathematics.

The specific criteria established for participation in the program were:

1. The parent must have a child presently enrolled in a District 5 school and demonstrate a lack of knowledge concerning the local educational agency, its structures, laws and functions.

2. The students must be presently enrolled in a District 5 school.

3. Both parents and students must demonstrate a strong desire to participate in the program.

The first objective was to be achieved through workshops and meetings sponsored by the School Community program and varied community groups and agencies. The original intent was to give intensive training to forty parent participants with the focus being primarily upon the structure, laws and functions of the Central Board of Education, the Community School Board and the local School District.

Instead of the intensive training program focusing on one area and including forty parents, the program was modified to include a series of diverse workshops with different participants at each workshop. Five hundred parents participated in 21 workshops. The workshop topics were suggested by parents and included among others Special Education, School Board Elections, Student Records and Central Board Duties and Responsibilities.

The second objective was to be achieved through a tutorial program administered by 10 teacher aids from Columbia University under the supervision of a licensed teacher. The program operated five days a week from 3:30 P.M. to 8:30 P.M. throughout the school term. Recruitment of students to be tutored was done by workshop participant parents who assembled lists of students in need of remediation. The total number of tutees was 55. Evaluation of this aspect of the program was accomplished by using the Metropolitan Achievement Test as a pre- and post-test.

II. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The program is staffed by: one program coordinator, two senior school-neighborhood workers, one parent program assistant, one family worker, one teacher, one clerk-typist, and ten teacher aides (tutors).

Each of the 21 workshops was viewed by the School-Community Project as aiding in the development of cadres of parents who examined specific school-oriented issues through formalized workshops.

The training curriculum for the selected parent cadres was originally designed to include some of the following knowledge areas:

(a) The New York City Board of Education, its origin, history, how it operates and the manner in which key policy decisions affect the schools.

(b) The New York City public school Central Administration, its various units and divisions plus the functioning of key personnel.

(c) The decentralization law and the structure of local school districts with a special emphasis on the structure and functioning of District 5.

(d) The organization and functioning of parent advisory councils.

(e) The School Board election process.

(f) Student Rights and the Maintenance of School Records.

Among other duties, the two Senior School-Neighborhood Workers handled the logistics of finding workshop space and providing needed materials; they also coordinated aspects of the tutorial program, visited schools and functioned as advocates for both students and parents. The two parent program assistants assisted the Senior School-Neighborhood Workers and acted generally as a liaison between the program and the community.

The tutorial program ran from 3:30 to 8:30, Monday through Friday, both on the program premises and, at times, in students' homes. Fridays were also used for staff meetings and in-service training. Tutors kept a log on the work of their students and were in contact with both the parents and the regular classroom teacher. Besides basic remedial reading and mathematics work the tutees were encouraged to participate in intellectual games such as scrabble and chess. Once a month cultural enrichment trips were taken to such places as the United Nations and the New York Times.

III. EVALUATION DESIGN

In order to determine the degree to which the School-Community Program met its objectives of (a) orienting and training District 5 parents in specific school oriented areas and (b) providing tutorial services for District 5 students in Reading and Arithmetic, the following evaluation procedures were employed:

1. Parent Survey

A three-page parent survey was given to selected parents to ascertain their perceptions of the tutoring program.

2. Student Records Survey

A one-page, 17-item Student Records Survey was administered to 22 parents who attended the April 17, 1975 Student Records Workshop. It was expected that 75% of the surveyed parents would give a correct response to 65% of the items.

3. Standardized Test Scores

As a measure of the tutorial program's effectiveness, the Spring 1974 reading subtest of the MAT (grade equivalent) was utilized as a pre-test score and the Spring 1975 reading comprehension subtest of the New York City public school standardized tests (grade equivalent) was utilized as a post-test score.

Historical regression procedures were utilized to determine predicted post-test scores and the correlated *t* test was applied to test the significance of differences between predicted and observed post-test scores. Grades 3-5 were combined because of low numbers in the separate grades.

IV. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Program effectiveness was determined by analyzing the results of the evaluation procedures that were employed. Table 1 indicates a percentage rating for yes responses. Results from the Parent Survey indicate that those parents who responded gave generally positive feedback with regard to the ten questions.

Table 1

Parent Survey: Yes/No Response Questions

Questions	% Rating for Yes Responses (N=10)
1. Does child like tutoring?	90%
2. Does child talk about school?	80%
3. Does child talk about tutoring?	90%
4. Does child want to continue tutoring?	90%
5. Has child's behavior changed for the better since being in the program?	90%
6. Do you feel positively about your child being tutored?	100%
7. Do you feel your child has learned something?	100%
8. Do you feel your child does better in school since being tutored?	90%
9. Have you expressed feelings about the program to program personnel?	70%
10. Did they listen to what you had to say?	70%

Table 2 details Student Rights Survey results. It was expected that 75% of the surveyed parents would give a correct response to 65% of the 17 items listed on the Student Records Survey. Actually, 73% of the parents surveyed gave a correct response to 65% of the items.

Table 2

Student Rights Survey Results (N=22)

No. Correct	Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
17	1	1
16	2	3
15	1	4
14	3	7
13	4	11
12	2	13(73% got 65% correct)
11	3	16
10	2	18
9	3	21
8	1	22

The pre-test MAT scores were used to determine expected post-test achievement scores. Comparisons were then made between predicted and observed post-test results utilizing a correlated t test. The results are Presented in Table 3. The observed post-test scores demonstrated that there were gains in reading achievement, in grades 3-5, and in grade 6, but there were no significant differences between predicted and observed post-test means. There was no observable gain in grade 7.

Table 3

Comparison of Reading Achievement Scores of Participants in the School-Community Tutoring Program

		Pretest		Predicted Posttest		Observed Posttest		
Grade	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t
7	8	5.78	1.30	6.38	1.46	5.75	1.60	-0.93
6	12	5.38	1.31	6.05	1.53	6.67	2.26	1.53
3-5	10	3.01	0.84	3.51	1.08	3.45	0.97	-0.20

NOTE: Negative t values indicate that observed posttest means were less than predicted posttest means.

V. PROGRAM STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

The following strengths and weaknesses were noted:

Strengths

1. The parent workshops worked well in terms of encouraging parents to become involved in school programs. In addition, the units established an informal referral network that disseminated information regarding non-educational community service areas such as housing and child care.

2. By setting up and running workshops at different sites, the staff established reciprocal working arrangements with other community agencies, such as the Housing Authority and the Public Education Association.

3. The liaison between the project staff and the parents plus the daily tutoring program encouraged the "community" aspect of the program as opposed to the "worker-client" relationship so typical in many bureaucratic agencies.

Weaknesses

1. Several project staff members spent an inordinate amount of time negotiating with the Board of Education and several of the host schools for reimbursement payments and test scores.

2. Some host school personnel had difficulty understanding that the tutorial program is a public funded supplement to their educational program.

3. Evaluation of the parent workshops was a persistent problem. Few project workshops were formally evaluated in written form and project workers strongly felt that surveying participants created stress factors characteristic of a test situation.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Non-test oriented evaluative methods should be developed for each parent workshop and a written evaluation should be a part of each workshop.

2. A member of the program staff should be assigned the task of negotiating with the school bureaucracy, not only on behalf of the tutorial program but also to assist the organization of parent groups in terms of establishing a positive working relationship with Board of Education and host school personnel.

3. Successful techniques and methods for working with large groups of parents over periods of time should be detailed and recorded in order to enhance the success of future parent workshops.

4. The program has the potential to satisfy needs of parents. The program should be continued provided that the above recommendations are considered for implementation.

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Final Report
July, 1975

Function No. 20-53407

EVALUATION OF CITY-WIDE UMBRELLA PROGRAMS

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

1974 - 1975 SCHOOL YEAR

"RICHMONDTOWN RESTORATION EDUCATION PROJECT"

Prepared by: Regis Bernhardt

I. INTRODUCTION

The Richmondtown Restoration Education Project was a social studies program for New York City school children. Richmondtown, which is historically and geographically the center of Staten Island, is a multi-acre restoration which exhibits the evolution of an American village from the seventeenth through the nineteenth centuries. The Education Project was initially developed in 1968, through the cooperation of the Education Department of the Staten Island Historical Society and personnel from Community School District #31.

The Project's primary activity was to provide students with tours of the restored village during which crafts demonstrations were to be presented and information concerning American history provided.

Program personnel were also to visit schools to make presentations to classes or assemblies. Evening workshops were to be held for adults in which instruction, by expert craftsmen, was to be provided in such areas as needlecraft, pottery, leathercraft and colonial cooking.

The Project was to be staffed by a full-time coordinator and nine part-time paraprofessionals. The coordinator was to be responsible for performing general administrative and supervisory tasks, acting as liaison with the Central Board of Education, and disseminating information concerning the Project to schools and scheduling their visits. Paraprofessionals were to serve as guides for the school groups and to demonstrate crafts to the students.

II. OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION DESIGN

Program objectives as stated in the proposal for funding were: (1) to acquaint students with community and other resources which would enrich or extend their learning of the role of the individual in community living; and (2) to increase students' understanding and appreciation of the American heritage.

In order to evaluate the program with respect to these objectives, a test was constructed. The test was based upon a vocabulary list which was mailed to schools prior to visits. Project personnel reviewed a preliminary draft of the test to prevent ambiguities and inaccuracies, and a pilot test was conducted with a sixth grade class. Results of the pilot test were used to establish the minimum sample size for the evaluation. Pre-tests were mailed to teachers prior to the visits. The tests were completed again following the post-trip instructional period. Results from the pre-test and post-test were compared utilizing a t test for correlated samples.

Visits were made to the project site to observe project activities and to interview personnel. Questionnaires were completed by the personnel and by a sample of teachers who had visited Richmondtown with their classes.

III. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The Richmondtown Restoration Evaluation Project was fully implemented. Records available in the Coordinator's office indicated that most of the visits which had been scheduled during the year had been made. The exceptions were not the fault of the project but were usually because of transportation or scheduling problems on the part of schools.

Project policy required that requests to visit Richmondtown be made in writing. Written confirmation of dates was provided by the Coordinator. Visiting groups were limited in size to sixty children, and a supervisory adult was required to be present for every fifteen children. Materials were mailed to the classes prior to the visit. These included a description of tour procedures, background information concerning the restored buildings, a reading list, and a vocabulary list.

Two tours were scheduled each day, Tuesday through Friday. The tours were approximately two hours in length, and included five buildings and four craft demonstrations. Classes were divided into small groups for the tour, with a paraprofessional assigned to each group as a guide. Different tour routes were followed by the groups in order that rooms and demonstrations not be crowded during the presentations.

Observations were made of a junior high school group and two elementary school groups during tours of the restoration site. During the tours the guides presented information concerning the history of Richmondtown, and they described the American life styles during the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries. Articles on display in buildings were used to illustrate the presentations. Demonstrations were provided by a leather crafter, potter, printer, and a spinner and weaver. The children demonstrated a high interest level throughout the tour, and the paraprofessionals evidenced a good ability to stimulate and to respond to questions. The level at which the material was presented was varied for the different age groups. The teachers of the junior high school group had provided a question sheet on which they were to list information. The children were anxious to complete the questions during the tour, but this hindered movement from place to place. The guides suggested that the forms be completed on a group basis back at the school or during the return trip.

The evaluators asked several children informally about the classroom work which had taken place prior to the visits, and which would take place afterwards. It appeared that two of the classes were presently involved in units related to American history from this period and that lessons were to continue after the trip.

Project personnel were asked to rate the quality of various aspects of the program. A summary of their ratings is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Ratings by Program Personnel of Various Aspects
of the Richmondtown Restoration Education Project

Areas	N	Mean	S.D.
1. Suitability of physical facilities	8	4.63	.48
2. Suitability of available materials	9	4.56	.50
3. Availability of materials	9	4.56	.50
4. Sufficiency of materials	9	4.44	.68
5. Suitability of available equipment	9	4.67	.47
6. Availability of equipment	9	4.78	.42
7. Sufficiency of equipment	9	4.44	.68
8. Supportive services provided by administrative personnel	7	5.00	.00
9. Training provided	8	5.00	.00
10. Positive effect on pupil learning	8	4.75	.43

Note: The following scale was utilized in the rating process:
5=Excellent; 4=Very Good; 3=Fair; 2=Poor; 1=Very Poor.

Ratings assigned by the Richmondtown personnel were quite high. The staff recognized that the restoration process was still in progress, but felt that existing facilities were excellent to accomplish project objectives. Expanded rest facilities and an area where children might eat lunch were indicated as needs to be met in the development plans for Richmondtown. Materials and equipment were rated very high as well. Personnel were unanimous in rating supportive services of administrative personnel, the Coordinator, as excellent. A similar rating was assigned to training provided to personnel. While the staff had contact with children for only a two hour period, it was felt that they should be asked to evaluate the degree to which they perceived pupils to learn from the town. Given this time limitation, it was found that the staff assigned a very high rating to the extent to which the visit had a positive effect on pupil learning.

A questionnaire was mailed to a sample of twenty-five teachers who had visited the Richmondtown Restoration with their classes. The teachers were asked to rate various aspects of the program and to provide information concerning the manner in which the trip was integrated into their teaching units. Eighteen teachers submitted completed questionnaires. Table 2 provides a summary of the teachers' ratings.

Table 2

Teacher Ratings of Various Aspects of the Richmondtown Restoration Education Project

Area	Excel- lent 5	Very Good 4	Fair 3	Poor 2	Very Poor 1	NR*
1. Suitability of physical facilities	9	5	4			
2. Suitability of available materials	9	8	1			
3. Instruction of guides	12	5	1			
4. Appropriateness of information	13	5				
5. Attention of children during tour	12	6				
6. Pre-trip information provided by Richmondtown	2	8	5	2		1
7. Positive effect on pupils' learning	9	9				
8. Positive effect of pupils' behavior	6	10			1	1
9. Positive effect on pupils' attitudes toward self	3	6	4		1	4
10. Positive effect on pupils' attitudes toward school	5	6	3		1	3

*NR=No response

The areas directly related to the program were rated as "very good" or better by most of the teachers. The only area which the majority of the teachers did not rate as "excellent" was pre-trip information. However, the majority did rate it as "very good." The one teacher who had rated this particular area as poor provided a comment. It was stated that "they used to send more information." Another stated that "more pre-trip material describing Richmondtown should be provided."

In the areas related to the program's effect on pupils, the ratings were more varied. The difficulty of rating these areas in a program which has limited contact with children was recognized by the evaluators, but it was felt that some data should be obtained. All of the teachers felt that the program had positive effects on learning while the majority of teachers felt that it had a positive effect on pupils' behavior, and their attitudes toward self and school.

All of the teachers praised the program. They had made visits in previous years. A frequent comment was that Richmondtown was the "best" of the educational trips they had made with classes.

The teachers praised the guides for their knowledgeability and for the manner in which material was presented. One teacher stated that the trip was a "living experience in history - thanks to our wonderful guides." However, several teachers indicated that guides occasionally were "too rigid" or "impatient" with children who were "excited" by the visit or who were "inquisitive and physically active."

The most commonly cited weakness was the lack of an area to eat lunch and the inadequacy of rest facilities for large groups.

Teachers indicated that they integrated the trip with American history units on the bicentennial and colonial times. Emphasis had been placed on the Dutch settlement, Staten Island history, and how man survived in colonial times. The information obtained during the trip was found to be easily related to the units. Teaching activities included discussions of the word list provided by the project, writing stories or reports about the trip, discussions of crafts, explanations of restoration processes, use of filmstrips about colonial times, and use of photographs taken while on the tour. Instructional periods directly related to the trip ranged from one hour to four hours prior to the trip and from one hour to eight hours after the trip.

Several teachers indicated that the trip was used for motivational purposes in subject areas other than social studies, such as language arts and art.

IV. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Evaluation of the effectiveness of an educational program which provides a treatment or service over a limited period of time is difficult. In this particular instance, the actual period of direct contact between program personnel and students was approximately two hours. Expectations that the program directly increase students' awareness, understanding and knowledge in the stated areas must be tempered by this fact. In order to achieve the stated objectives, the activities of the Project must be integrated into the regular instructional program.

The vocabulary test designed for the present evaluation was mailed to a sample of teachers who were scheduled to visit Richmondtown in the late spring. Teachers were to administer the pre-test prior to any instruction directly related to the trip. Post-tests were mailed to the teachers the week of the trip. They were to be administered after all post-trip instruction had occurred. Classes sampled included grades two through six. Children's performance on the pre- and post-tests was compared through use of correlated _t_ tests. Results of the analysis are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Comparison of Pre-Trip and Post-Trip Vocabulary Test Scores of Children

		Pre-test		Post-test		
Grade	N	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	_t_
2	19	4.32	2.12	6.37	2.50	4.07**
3	68	5.00	1.91	9.38	3.23	10.17**
4	42	7.45	3.17	11.36	2.76	8.42**
5	20	6.50	1.88	10.75	2.81	6.87**
6	18	10.50	2.19	12.06	3.36	1.81

**$p < .01$

Statistically significant gains in vocabulary related to the Richmondtown tour were attained by children in grades two through five. The difference between the two administrations of the test for the sixth grade group was not statistically significant, but it should be noted that there was a gain and the group had the highest pre- and post-test means.

V. PROGRAM STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

The Richmondtown Restoration provides an excellent setting in which children come into contact with history. For example, children sit on the benches of the Voorlezer's House and discuss how children were educated during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The coordinator and the paraprofessional staff were dedicated to the project. The compatibility between their personal interests and their work in the Project was obvious. Their service to the program extended beyond the hours which they are assigned to work. The paraprofessionals were well trained and demonstrated expertise in the content areas covered in the Project.

Another program strength was the flexibility provided. Range and scope of information provided by guides varied according to the grade level of the children. In addition, schools could designate special interest areas they wish to be covered during their visit.

One weakness of the program was found to be the manner of instruction in a few of the crafts areas. One teacher stated that the "skilled persons... should assume a lack of knowledge on the part of children," and recommended that the tools be named and be displayed as they are being used. The evaluators in their visits found that the printing and spinning and weaving demonstrations did utilize the recommended methodologies.

The lack of lunch facilities and adequate rest facilities are a weakness. It should be noted that program personnel are aware of the problem and emphasized this in the pre-trip information sent to schools. Plans for future development of the Restoration include provisions for such facilities.

Because the tour covers a three century period of American history in two hours, children may become confused by the mix of materials and demonstrations.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of information obtained during site visits and information obtained from staff and teachers the following recommendations are made:

1. The program should be continued. As previously stated, the Richmondtown Restoration provides an excellent setting for the study of American history.

2. Information provided to schools prior to visits should be reviewed. Ratings assigned by teachers to the material were generally low, particularly in comparison with ratings of other program aspects. The importance of pre-trip and post-trip instruction by teachers should be emphasized in the material. Teacher guides might be prepared to assist in presentation of such instruction. Assistance in preparing these materials might be sought from teachers who have visited the site. These teachers could share their teaching methods and materials with others.

3. In-service training for the paraprofessionals should be provided to assist them in further developing ways to respond to "active" children.

4. In-service training for the paraprofessionals who demonstrate

the crafts should be provided to increase the effectiveness of their teaching methods.

5. Efforts should be made to be more definitive in terms of the time periods being covered in sections of the tour. The mix of materials and information from various periods can be confusing to children.

VII. SUMMARY

The Richmondtown Restoration Education Project was a social studies program for New York City school children. The Project's primary activity was to provide children with tours of the restored village during which crafts demonstrations were presented and information concerning American history was provided. The objectives of the program were: (1) to acquaint students with community and other resources which would enrich or extend their learning of the role of the individual in community living; and (2) to increase students' understanding and appreciation of the American heritage.

Evaluation of the extent to which objectives were achieved was accomplished through pre-trip and post-trip administration of a test designed specifically for the project. Site visits were made to observe program processes, to interview staff and to review program records. In addition, questionnaires were completed by teachers whose class had visited Richmondtown.

Results of the evaluation process indicated that the project had achieved the stated objectives. It was found that the project was well administered and was staffed by highly competent personnel. Teachers presented high praise for the project.

Several areas where the program might be improved were noted. These included the pre-trip information provided to schools and in-service training of paraprofessionals.

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Final Report
July, 1975

Function No. 20-53408

EVALUATION OF CITY-WIDE UMBRELLA PROGRAMS

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

SUMMER 1974

"SCHOOL COMMUNITY NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS: PARENT-CHILD ORIENTATION PROGRAM"

Prepared by: Regis Bernhardt
and
Lillian Levine,
Research Assistant

INTRODUCTION

The Parent-Child Orientation Program, conducted during the summer of 1974 at P.S. 289, was intended to raise the reading and mathematics performance levels of forty children. The program was designed to service children who had been retained in fourth or fifth grade because of low reading scores. Staffing for the program was to include a coordinator, a reading teacher, a mathematics teacher, three family assistants, two educational assistants, and a student aide. The coordinator was to be responsible for all administrative responsibilities including planning program activities, staffing the program, supervising personnel, preparing budgets, maintaining records, and identifying, recruiting and selecting target children. The two teachers, with the aid of the educational assistants, were to provide classroom instruction in reading and mathematics. The family workers were to participate in parent workshops, visit homes, identify special family needs and accompany parents on visits to public and private agencies. A student aide, who was to be responsible for clerical work, was not hired.

II. OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION DESIGN

The primary program objective, as described in the proposal, was to raise the levels of performance in reading and mathematics of those children who participated in the program for at least two months. It was anticipated that 85% of the participants would return to their regular classroom and attain a passing grade sufficient to be promoted.

The following evaluation procedures were employed:

(1) Interviews were held with the program coordinator to obtain data relative to program activities and outcomes. Program records were made available by the coordinator for review by the evaluation staff.

(2) Interviews were conducted with the reading and mathematics teachers and the family assistants who worked in the summer program. The purpose of the interviews was to obtain information concerning the staff members' involvement in the program's activities and their perceptions of the program's outcomes.

(3) Participating children's scores on the Spring, 1974 city-wide Metropolitan Achievement Tests were to be provided by the coordinator and were to be used to ascertain the degree to which the participating children were in need of treatment in the summer program. While the original program proposal specified that pre- and post-tests would be administered, no post-treatment tests were administered by program personnel. Pre-test data were not available at the time the evaluation was performed. As an alternative, teacher records of children's progress were analyzed in order to identify specific areas in which children made gains in reading and mathematics.

(4) The coordinator was also to provide information concerning the numbers of children who had returned to their schools and who had attained a passing grade sufficient to be promoted, but these data were not available.

III. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Information concerning program implementation presented in this report was obtained from interviews with the program coordinator and the available staff, and a review of program records.

Approval for the funding of the program was obtained in June, 1974. Difficulties were experienced in identifying and recruiting children. Program staff were able to obtain the names and addresses of potential participants during the final week of the regular school year. The coordinator stated that two mailings made to parents resulted in thirty affirmative responses prior to the start of classes. He indicated that enrollment continued during the first week of the program and finally reached a total of forty-one. It was reported that after four children withdrew from the program early in the summer, enrollment remained constant at 37. A list of the participants' names was provided.

Attendance records were made available to the evaluators. The children had been divided into four groups for instructional purposes, and twenty-six separate names were listed. The number of days attended for each child, and the average attendance rates are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Parent-Child Orientation Program: Attendance

Group	Participants	Days of Attendance	Group Average
I (N=6)	A	27	
	B	26	
	C	27	
	D	27	
	E	22	
	F	26	25.8 days

Table 1 (cont.)

Group	Participant	Days of Attendance	Group Average
II (N=10)	A	28	
	B	25	
	C	20	
	D	25	
	E	23	
	F	25	
	G	12	
	H	26	
	I	25	
	J	17	22.6 days
III (N=5)	A	27	
	B	25	
	C	25	
	D	22	
	E	25	24.8 days
IV (N=5)	A	22	
	B	22	
	C	16	
	D	16	
	E	21	19.4 days
		Total Average	23.1 days

Two sessions were conducted Monday through Thursday, with the children equally divided between the morning and afternoon sessions. On the six Fridays, all children attended and were taken on trips. All members of the staff accompanied the children, and parents frequently participated. The trips included visits to the Brooklyn Children's Museum, a Yankee game at Shea Stadium, Queens Hall of Science, Coney Island, the Brooklyn Botanical Gardens, and the Public Library.

The Project staff was asked to complete a questionnaire concerning various aspects of the programs. Responses were obtained from the coordinator, the two teachers and the three Family assistants. The resulting data are presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Parent-Child Orientation Program - Project Personnel Survey

Statements	Mean Rating[a] (N=6)
1. Suitability of physical facilities	4.3
2. Suitability of available materials	3.3
3. Availability of materials	2.7
4. Sufficiency of materials	2.3
5. Suitability of available equipment	3.3
6. Availability of equipment	2.8
7. Sufficiency of equipment	2.6
8. Supportive services provided by administrative personnel	4.0
9. Training provided	4.0[b]
10. Assistance of paraprofessionals	4.3
11. Positive effect on pupils' learning	4.1
12. Positive effect on pupils' behavior	3.8
13. Positive effect on pupils' attitudes toward self	3.8
14. Positive effect on pupils' attitudes toward school	4.0

[a] Response Scale: 5=Excellent; 4=Very Good; 3=Fair; 2=Poor; 1=Very Poor

[b] Two respondents indicated this item to be inapplicable.

For purposes of discussion, a mean rating above 3.5 was considered to be "good," below 2.5, "poor," and between 2.5 and 3.5, "fair." The respondents felt that the physical facilities were good, but the availability and sufficiency of equipment and materials were found to be fair or poor. The latter point was supported by comments of the staff during interviews. Because of late program approval, materials could not be ordered far enough in advance to be available at the start of the program.

The reading teacher borrowed equipment and materials from the school where he regularly teaches. Pencils, paper, stencils, and related supplies had to be borrowed from regular school program materials.

The supportive services of the administrative staff and the assistance of paraprofessionals were rated as good. While no training was provided for the teaching staff, the Family assistants rated their training as very good.

With respect to the perceived impact of the program on participating children, the mean ratings were in the good range for all four statements. Positive effects were perceived to have occurred on pupils' learning and behavior and on their attitudes toward school and themselves.

Teachers and paraprofessionals were hampered in their work because of the lack of equipment. Materials and equipment which had been ordered were not received while the program was in operation. Fortunately, the reading teacher, who had taught in P.S. 289 during the regular school year, was able to utilize this school's equipment. Diagnostic tests were not available, nor were appropriate achievement tests. The teachers devised tests to identify children's strengths and weaknesses. There was one tape recorder listening center, but this equipment was stolen during the summer and replacement was not possible. The problem of the late ordering of materials and the failure to receive equipment and supplies was a serious one. A film ordered for use in the summer program was received in October. Children had no pencils so the family workers purchased them for the children. Paper supplies were never received. Rather than cancel the trips which had been instrumental in stimulating and maintaining children's interest, the staff paid transportation costs and obtained free or reduced admission from the places visited whenever possible.

Parent involvement and interest was a central program focus. Three parent workshops were held during the summer. One workshop was held in the evening. Attendance at the workshops was reported to be "fair." All of the staff participated in the workshops which stressed the need for cooperation of parents with teachers and children. In addition, teachers were required to schedule at least 15 minutes each day for consultation with parents. The coordinator noted that parents frequently took advantage of this time by visiting teachers to ask questions.

IV. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Spring, 1974 Metropolitan Achievement Test scores of participating children, and the numbers of children who had been promoted when they returned to school were not available. Teacher records of children's progress in reading and mathematics were provided for 26 participants. These records were content analyzed in order to identify specific areas in which children made gains in the two subject areas. The teachers did not complete checklists, but rather wrote descriptive sentences about the children. Furthermore, records were not available for all of the children. Therefore the frequencies cannot be interpreted in terms of percentages of target population children who improved in reading and mathematics. These were the only data available concerning children's progress.

Tables 3 through 6 present a summary of the analyses of the teachers' comments.

Table 3
Parent-Child Orientation Program - Student Development in Reading

Students' Development Areas	Has Shown Improvement Group					Has Difficulty Group				
	I	II	III	IV	T	I	II	III	IV	T
Inferential Thinking	2	3	1	1	7	2	0	2	0	4
Phonics	5	0	3	2	10	1	2	2	0	5
Comprehension	5	1	2	2	10	1	2	2	0	5
Decoding	2	1	2	3	8	1	1	1	0	3
Syllabication	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	5
Vocabulary	0	2	0	1	3	1	1	2	0	4

Table 4
Parent-Child Orientation Program - Reading Teacher Comments

The Student:	Group				
	I	II	III	IV	T
Shows interest in reading	2	0	3	1	6
Has the ability to work independently	2	3	3	3	11
Needs individual attention	4	0	2	1	7
Has the ability to work in small groups	1	1	4	4	10
Has the ability to grasp new concepts	0	3	2	3	8
Has poor work-study habits	1	0	1	4	6
Has a limited attention span	4	0	2	1	7
Is self-motivated	2	2	2	3	9
Needs reinforcement from home	2	1	5	1	9

Table 5
Parent-Child Orientation Program - Student Development in Mathematics

Students' Development Areas	Has Shown Improvement Group					Has Difficulty Group				
	I	II	III	IV	T	I	II	III	IV	T
Addition	1	9	3	4	17	3	1	2	0	6
Subtraction	2	8	2	4	16	3	2	3	0	8
Multiplication	1	5	1	1	8	4	5	4	3	16
Division	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	2	10
Roman Numerals	1	6	0	1	8	3	1	2	2	8
Fractions	1	6	0	1	8	3	1	2	2	8

Table 6
Parent-Child Orientation Program - Mathematics Teachers' Comments

The Student:	Group				
	I	II	III	IV	T
Shows interest in mathematics	3	5	1	1	10
Has the ability to work independently	2	7	0	1	10
Needs individual attention	5	4	5	3	17
Has the ability to work in small groups	0	7	0	1	8
Has difficulty in grasping new concepts	3	2	4	3	12
Has poor work-study habits	3	3	4	2	12
Has a limited attention span	3	2	2	0	7
Is self-motivated	2	6	0	1	9
Needs reinforcement from home	4	3	5	3	15

As can be seen in Tables 3 and 5, a number of children improved in basic reading and mathematics skill areas. Of the children for whom data were available, 46 per cent showed improvement in the areas of phonics and comprehension. In the mathematics development areas, 65 per cent showed improvement in addition, and 62 per cent in subtraction. It should be noted that the mathematics teacher indicated that large numbers of children had difficulty with multiplication and division, 62 and 38 per cent, respectively.

Tables 4 and 6 present a summary of the two teachers' comments concerning work and study habits of the children. It should be emphasized that the comments were not indended to indicate progress, but were intended for use by the children's regularly assigned teachers. The problem areas were ones which would be expected to occur. The mathematics teacher indicated that 65 per cent need individual attention, 50 per cent need reinforcement from home, and 45 per cent had difficulty in grasping new concepts and have poor work-study habits. The reading teacher's responses were more favorable than those of the mathematics teacher: 27 per cent were noted to need individual attention, 23 per cent had poor work study habits, and 27 per cent had a limited attention span.

Conclusions concerning the program's effectiveness must be extremely limited. No "hard data" exists to support definitive statements. It appears, on the basis of teachers' comments regarding children's progress and the data obtained in interviews with program personnel, that children benefitted from the program.

V. PROGRAM STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

It is extremely difficult to asses strengths and weaknesses of a program on an ex-post-facto basis. Strong reliance must be placed on information obtained from interviews conducted with program personnel, rather than on observation of program processes. However, ready access to program records, which could be used to document the interview data, was provided.

Late approval of the program prevented systematic cooperation between schools and the program with respect to identifying and recruiting children in need of assistance in reading and mathematics. While the specified number of target population children was eventually obtained, information from the children's school records was not readily available. Spring 1974 MAT test results, which were to be used for placement purposes and for the pre-test scores for evaluation were not available in most cases. The failure to provide funds which had been specified in the program budget seriously handicapped program personnel. The coordinator reported that materials, such as paper and pencils, had to be purchased by program staff. The reading and mathematics teachers obtained materials from their regular school assignment sites for use in the program. In his report on the summer program prepared in August, 1974, the coordinator wrote that had it not been for such cooperation "our program would have been destined to failure."

Another serious program weakness was the failure to conduct post-testing of program participants. The coordinator indicated that no funds were available to purchase tests and that those tests that were available were not of the appropriate level.

The major program strength appeared to be the commitment of the staff. The coordinator managed to obtain support of various community agencies for several of the trips. He also was able to obtain some supplies from schools or district offices. When other alternatives were not possible, staff contributed monies from their own salaries to obtain material or to pay for public transit costs for trips.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is imperative that summer programs be approved as early as possible in the school year. Adequate time for making program proposals operational must be provided. It appears that the children who participated in this program were fortunate to receive the services of personnel committed to the program. The staff was faced with many obstacles but was still able to provide services to children.

Evaluation of summer programs should be conducted while the program is functioning. Obtaining data concerning program processes is seriously limited unless observations are made. In addition, guidance can be provided to program personnel with respect to testing of children.

Because the program follows a diagnostic-prescriptive approach, appropriate tests chould be given at the beginning and end of the summer program.

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Final Report
July, 1975

Function No. 20-53409

EVALUATION OF CITY-WIDE UMBRELLA PROGRAMS

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

1974-1975 SCHOOL YEAR

"WALK AND TALK PROGRAM"

Prepared by: Carolyn N. Hedley

I. THE PROGRAM

The intention of the Walk and Talk Program was to provide instruction and tutoring to immigrant children and to children from bilingual homes in the subject areas of reading, communications and mathematics. It was felt that the tutored children benefit in terms of their English, their reading, their written work, their mathematics and in the subject areas for which they were doing home assignments. Much of the tutoring was to be done by high school students from the neighborhood area, who were to be trained and supervised by the staff. This tutoring-training was intended to aid the high school students in their own performance in these curricular areas.

Description of Program: The children (grades 3-6) were enrolled in an after-school and Saturday program which emphasized not only the study skills in the areas of communication, reading and mathematics, but gave these students an orientation to the city by providing monthly Saturday trips (upon which the study of many of the curriculum skills was based) to such places as Radio City Music Hall, the Circus and the parks, zoos and recreational facilities of New York City.

Selection of Participants: Participants (grades 3-6) met the criteria of retardation by two years or more in basic skills. Priority in descending order was given to: 1) new or recent immigrant children who spoke a language other than English as their primary language; 2) children who had been in the United States for less than two years; 3) children from bilingual homes showing severe retardation in basic skills. High school students were selected on the basis of: 1) bilingual language ability, and 2) interest in tutoring children.

The program was a year-round program, running through the summer months as well as the school year. The school (P.S. 2-M) was a focal point in this lower East Side Manhattan community and thus it was a natural center from which to implement such a program.

Population Served: The program was structured to serve approximately 90 children of elementary school age and approximately 20 children of high school age.

II. EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

Inasmuch as the summer program had terminated by the time the evaluation had begun, it was necessary to assess the summer program by use of a questionnaire. (Fortunately, most of the personnel in the program were teachers or aides in P.S. 2-M and were therefore available for interviews.) A questionnaire was developed and used for evaluation of the summer program component of the Walk and Talk Program as well as for the program which functioned during the school year. The identical staff for the program did not function year around due to a ruling by the board of Education regarding a salary maximum which could be earned by the director and the teachers in the New York Public Schools.

Questionnaire: The questionnaire was developed after preliminary visitation in order to ascertain which areas should be covered in such an instrument. The questionnaire provided for an extensive survey for the evaluative director to perform on each class, as well as an interview form for the director, the teachers, the teacher aides, the student aides and the children who participated in the program.

Tests: The evaluation design from the Board of Education called for pre and post tests (Stanford Achievement Test Battery) to be administered to all of the children in the program, including the high school aides. The test used was the Stanford Achievement Test in Reading, Mathematics and Auditory Skills. The pretest was administered as directed and the scores were recorded and reported to the evaluator.

Evaluation Forms: Final informal evaluation was done by means of an evaluation form, which was administered to all participants in the program - the director, the teachers, the teaching assistants, the student tutors and the students themselves.

III. FINDINGS

The effectiveness of the program was determined through visitation by the evaluator and through interview of program personnel, through statistical analysis of scores on the Stanford Achievement Tests, and through analysis of responses to questionnaires administered to the persons in the program. A cursory view of pretest scores revealed that many of the children were unable to read in English at all due to the fact that over two-thirds of them had been in this country less than a year. One class in which much Chinese was spoken was in effect, a TESOL program. Another class was taught in which translation was done. The third class is instructed mostly in English, since the students have acquired the rudiments of the English language.

Analysis of Standardized Test Scores: Analysis of standardized test scores on the Stanford Achievement Tests (SAT) with subtests in Auditory Comprehension, Mathematical Computations, and Mathematical Applications revealed no single pattern of significant improvement among the students from grades 3 to 6 (Table 1). Much of this lack of significance can be attributed to the very small number of the children to whom complete pre- and post-tests were administered. In all, there were over 170 children (counting those in summer school, many of whom went on to the Junior High School and were never tested) who were in the program. There was a very high transiency rate in the school in that many of the children move during the school year. Therefore, both the pre- and post-tests were not administered to a large number of the children who received program services.

Over two-thirds of the children in the program had been in the country for less than a year. (All of the Level II children fell into this category and many of the Level III children had been in the United States for less than a year.) These non-English speaking students spoke Chinese, Spanish or French; they did not take the New York City Reading Test due to the fact that they were non-English speaking. Although the director had attempted to control testing procedures, and the test-givers had attempted to help the children take the tests by reading some items aloud, the children found it impossible to take the test. Of the 170 children in the program, complete scores on the pre- and post-tests were available for less than 50 children. Approximately one-fourth of the sample was measured by means of the SAT. The small number in the sample reduced the likelihood that the children would indicate significant gains in test results. However, the obtained results should not be interpreted to mean that the program was less than successful. Other methods were used to arrive at the outcomes of the Walk and

TABLE 1

Analysis of Stanford Achievement Test Scores

Grade & Test	N	Pre-T Mean	SD	Post-T Mean	SD	t
Grade 3 (III)						
.Auditory Comp.	5	2.00	.65	2.86	.89	1.74
.Reading Comp.	4	2.50	.22	3.45	.45	4.55*
.Math Comp.	4	2.90	.82	4.38	.56	9.97**
.Math App.	4	2.95	.43	3.18	.73	1.04
Grade 4 (III)						
.Auditory Comp.	7	1.69	.50	2.10	1.17	1.15
.Reading	5	2.28	.70	2.98	.69	3.61*
.Math Comp.	7	4.00	1.60	5.23	1.14	1.86
.Math App.	11	3.07	.98	3.11	1.20	.14
Grade 5 (III)						
.Auditory Comp.	10	2.39	.64	3.57	1.95	2.26*
.Reading Comp.	8	3.98	1.23	4.73	1.90	1.00
.Math Comp.	7	5.19	2.00	6.04	.53	.44
.Math App.	8	4.65	1.73	4.25	1.71	-1.49
Grade 6 (II)						
.Auditory Comp.	6	1.35	.63	1.55	.50	.63
.Reading Comp.	6	1.55	.23	2.27	.40	6.07**
.Math Comp.	6	4.58	.63	3.98	.79	-4.38**
.Math App.	6	2.75	.79	4.25	.67	3.45*
Grade 6 (III)						
.Auditory Comp.	15	2.60	1.16	2.88	1.11	.84
.Reading Comp.	15	3.65	1.13	4.41	1.50	3.02**
.Math Comp.	15	6.25	.91	6.67	1.01	1.91
.Math App.	17	4.68	1.26	5.62	1.39	4.43 **

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level

NOTE: Negative t values indicate that posttest means were less than pretest means.

NB Grade 2 had only one child with pre and post test scores for all four subtests, one with data for two subtests; therefore no analysis could be undertaken.

Grade 3 (II) had only two children with complete data; no analysis.

Grade 4 (II) had only two children with complete scores and subtests; no analysis.

Grade 5 (II) had only one child with complete scores; no analysis.

Talk Program.

Attendance: Throughout the year, when observers visited the program it was noted that over 95% of the children enrolled were in attendance. In like manner, the high school tutors were also dedicated to the program; they were paid only $2.00 an hour for one and one-half hours per day, yet were present for their responsibilities, which they fulfilled conscientiously.

Reaction of the Teachers: By utilizing the information gained from all of the teachers in the program through questionnaires, interviews and observations, it was evident that the reaction of the teachers was positive toward the program. The children were developing the skills; they were gaining in a knowledge of the city and the culture in which they lived; and they were able to respond to tutoring on a small group basis in the subject areas and with their school assigned home work. Without this program, the children in the program would not get help with their homework and with their English, which would be an irreparable set-back to the acculturation process. Many of their parents work, so the program also provides supervision for the immigrant bilingual child. It was noted by the evaluator that even the most inclement weather did not keep these children from arriving at their classes.

According to the evaluation questionnaire filled out by all of the teachers and the director of the program, the trips were a basic part of the program; teachers would like to have more field trips, more materials, more help with spoken English, more classrooms and more teachers with smaller numbers of children. Substitutes should be provided by the program when teachers are ill. Teachers felt that tutors should be dropped if they lack social or academic skills. In general, the comments suggested not that the program should be substantially changed, but that it should provide more of the qualitative functions that it was already providing.

Reaction of the Teacher Aides: The reaction of the teacher aides was also positive. Many of the same comments that were made by the teachers were echoed by the teacher aides, who in large part were from the community. The aides concentrated on giving individual help and on keeping the program varied and applicable to the needs of the children. The teacher aides (community connected adults) appeared to be socially close to the children and very much appreciated by the students in terms of "seeing someone that they know." From their responses to the questionnaires, the teacher aides appeared to be quite able and conscientious. This same comment was made by the director of the program and the teachers, as well as by the students in the program. Several of the aides were concerned about the lack of supplies for the program, others felt that some snack after-school would be a positive contribution to the program. Several of the teacher aides said that if the program should be discontinued, it would have devastating effects upon the acculturation of the children in the community. Their sentiment was echoed by many of the community leaders and parents who were often present when the evaluator of the program appeared. All of these "outside" persons appeared to be very supportive of the program, both by their presence and by their comments.

Reaction of the Student Tutors: The high school students made a very positive contribution to the program. These seventeen students appeared on the job and were never observed to be less than dedicated to the elementary youngsters in the program. The high school students provided a strong continuity of the program to the community; moreover they provided strong, interested and positive role-models to the newly arrived imigrant youngster who was the focal student in the program. The maturity and dedication of many of these older students was extraordinary. For example, fourteen of the seventeen tutors answered the questionnaire fully; the three who did not had no opportunity to do so. Again, the study skills and the poise exhibited by the answers to these questions were quite professional. The high school students also exhibited a great deal of originality and resourcefulness in their work with the students; for instance, in answer to the question as to how to improve the program for next year, the answers were "I would like to have more materials." "I would like to help the children in areas other than reading and writing." "I would like to have a longer time with the students in order to teach them with their reading." "I would like to have more time to get to know the materials better." "I would like to have more recent materials."

Toward the end of the program (final evaluation forms were given out during mid-June) there appeared to be a deteriorating relationship between some of the tutors and some of the teachers. Whatever seemed to cause this rift should be avoided in the future, or should be systematically alleviated. High school students felt they should receive more pay. It also seems that, in some instances, they should be qualified academically and socially to tutor children. On the other hand, it is possible that teachers, who are accustomed to working with either adults or young children, should be apprised of some of the social and psychological needs of high school youth. For the better part of the program however, these high school student-tutors made a significant contribution to the studies, English-speaking abilities and the social needs of the younger children in the program.

The high school tutors would like to have more trips, more games, more class participation, more teacher planning with the staff, cultural programs in both English and Spanish and more classrooms utilized with smaller groups of children within smaller classes. They would also like to be better paid.

Reaction of the Students: Whatever the sentiments of the other participants in the program, the students, especially those who were able to write by the end of the program, were unequivocally enthusiastic. Unanimously, they wanted more field trips which they enjoyed very much; they were fond of their tutors for the most part; they liked their teachers, the program itself and the help with their home work. However, many, many of the students expressed strong negative feelings concerning the heavy testing component of the program.

Most of the students were not yet able to answer questionnaires in English. Therefore, in some cases the questionnaires were administered orally, while the teacher or an aide transcribed their answer on a paper. Even taking into account that the comments were screened through an interviewer, the children's attitude was respectful and appreciative. Many of the Chinese children in the program were recently from Hong Kong or Taiwan and from families who were seeking an opportunity for themselves and their children. The Spanish speaking youngsters were often from Central and South America. Their families also were hoping to become permanent residents, and they placed high priority upon literacy and educational needs. Although the children were very new to the city, they were aware of the dedication of the personnel in the program and responded to this sentiment. Some said that personnel in the program helped them not only in the school, but had given financial aid and social advice to the family. All of the children mentioned over and over again how much they liked the trips, especially to the Music Hall and to the Circus. These trips seemed to be a highlight in a rather circumscribed existence. From these trips, they were able to help their parents negotiate the subways in order to travel about Manhattan. All of them, without exception, said that they wanted to be in the program next year.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Walk and Talk Program has functioned in a highly effective manner for several years. Even with the limited data collected here, it is clear the program is working very well and should be continued for the benefit that it brings to the children. However, the following areas should be considered for possible alteration:

1. Field trips: More field trips should be made available to the program, since the children seem to benefit from them.

2. Materials: There should be more materials, in terms of paper and pencils, trade books, special materials, for helping in a TESOL program, more ditto work, and more reference materials. These materials should be delivered promptly or ordered the year previous to the program's funding in order for the program to be inaugurated effectively and without cost to the school.

3. Testing: The testing program is highly inappropriate and a source of anxiety and irritation to the children and to their tutors and teachers. Although testing must be done, if the children were given a simple short test on the ASPIRA model in reading, and a language fluency test, it would probably tend to measure reasonable progress in these areas. Unfortunately these materials have not been developed to any great degree in the Chinese language and/or the Spanish language for immigrant children. The present testing devices are far beyond the language abilities of the youngsters in the program and are nearly useless for the population; however it is difficult

to prescribe a solution to a very real problem in the program.

4. Program Expansion: Inasmuch as the program is designed to help children with basic learning skills, it should be expanded to the first and second grade children in the school also. Not only should the lower grades be included, the classes which number 30 should be smaller and the within-class groups should not be more than four persons to a tutor, so that children can have greater conversational opportunities as well as more individual attention. Children with learning disabilities should be added to the program, with an even smaller adult-student ratio than is now standard in the bilingual classroom.

5. Individualization: Pupil progress should be measured informally and more individually prescribed instruction should be undertaken in the basic skills. Progress charts and checklists might be used.

6. Program Content and Scheduling: If refreshments could be provided, the students would probably be content to stay in the program longer than the present closing time. At the end of the school day, juice, milk or cookies would enable the students to participate more effectively for a longer period of time in the Walk and Talk Program. An extension of time would allow for an E.S.L. component to be added to the program; the children should remain for two hours instead of an hour and a half.

7. Funding: The Board of Education should promptly process and pay the salaries of personnel in its Umbrella Programs. The $2.00 per hour salary rate for tutors, which is the current rate established by the New York City Board of Education, should be reviewed.

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Final Report
July, 1975

Function No. 20-53410

EVALUATION OF CITY-WIDE UMBRELLA PROGRAMS

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

1974 - 1975 SCHOOL YEAR

"TEACHER TRAINING AND INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION IN READING AND OTHER CURRICULUM AREAS"

Prepared by: Robert B. Hurley

I. INTRODUCTION

This program consisted of two separate components, but had as its goal the "improvement of reading skills for those children who consistently failed to maintain their grade levels." One component (The Future Teachers) was designed to attack this problem directly through two weekly, one-hour, after-school tutorial classes. The other approached the problem indirectly through a re-training program for both new and experienced teachers. Sixteen elementary and five junior high schools of school districts 18 and 23 were involved in both components.

II. PROGRAM EVALUATION

The children who were the identifiable recipients of the benefits of the tutorial program served as subjects in a pre- and post-program measurement of reading skills. Results of the Spring 1974 and the Spring 1975 New York City testing program were utilized as the bases for statistical analyses. Comparisons between pre-test and post-test results were made utilizing historical regression procedures wherever appropriate. Tables made available by the Office of Educational Evaluation were used to convert 1975 test results to comparable grade equivalent scores on the MAT.

Because of the nature of the Teacher Training Component no "hard data" were available. Interviews with a sample of teachers in the schools involved in the Teachers Training Program, utilizing an interview schedule developed for this study, were conducted in order to obtain information concerning the impact that this component had on their teaching approaches.

III. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

A. Future Teachers (Tutorial Component)

Approximately 550-600 identifiable students were to be served by this program. Subjects were recommended by the teachers to the principal, who then selected participants. The selection process may be best illustrated by one school where the principal reported that he selected participants from among those recommended on the basis of three factors: (1) the parents gave permission; (2) the student was receiving no other funded help; and (3) the student was only "somewhat behind" and his chances for improvement were rated as good.

The teacher in the tutorial program was a regular staff member, and this resulted in effective communication between the program's staff and the child's regular teacher. Because many parents picked up their children after the tutorial session at 4:00, there was an opportunity for communication between home and school.

The tutorial classes met two days per week for one hour, usually from 3:00 to 4:00 P.M. A few classes met from 7:30 to 8:30 A.M. in some junior high schools. Twenty-one schools (16 elementary and five junior highs) were served by this program. Eighteen of the schools were located in District 18 and three in District 23. Each class in each school consisted of approximately 30 children, and was staffed by one teacher, one teacher's aide, and a maximum of 15 high school seniors from four Brooklyn high schools who were members of their school's Future Teachers Club. The tutors were paid $2.00 per hour.

B. Teacher Training Component

Experienced teachers from 16 elementary schools (13 in District 18 and three in District 23) met on a monthly basis, and cooperatively set up sample demonstrations of a teaching method for a particular aspect of the reading program. These meetings generally lasted 1½ to 2 hours. The sixteen teachers were to return to their respective schools and arrange extra-school demonstrations through their principals, and were then to come to the next monthly meeting with an evaluation from the teaching staff in their schools of the previous month's demonstration.

However, there was no identifiable group of children that was a continuing recipient of the benefits of these meetings, since the interaction was not systematic and its implementation was subject to the influence of a variety of factors.

IV. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

A. Future Teachers (Tutorial Component)

Observations were conducted at ten elementary and three junior high schools involved in the tutorial program during the period from May 14 through June 3. Inspection of Table 1 (p. VI-4) indicates that the typical class consisted of fourteen pupils, somewhat less than half of those enrolled. There were six tutors for the fourteen pupils, again something less than half of those involved in the program. The typical pupil was a fourth or fifth grade girl, ½ to two years behind in reading, and her typical tutor was also a female. The pupils had been nominated by their classroom teacher or the guidance counselor, and parental permission had been secured for their participation.

It usually took 10-15 minutes of the allotted hour for the pupils, teachers and tutors to arrive and to settle down to work. Once settled down, however, the children and tutors worked earnestly. The usual ac-

Table 1

Summary of Observations of Tutorial Program: Attendance, Facilities, Procedures and Materials

School	Number of Children Attending	Number of Children Enrolled	Per Cent Attending	Number of Tutors Present	Number of Tutors Assigned	Per Cent Present	Educational Assistant	Reading Aloud	Flashcards	SRA Lab	Reader's Digest Program	Audio Tapes	Number of Classrooms Used	Teacher-Made Materials	Regular Reading Books	Workbooks	Library Books	Articulation	Remarks
PS 1	13	30	43	5	12	42	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Aud.	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	"Informal Articulation"
PS 2	13	31	42	8	14	57	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	
JHS 1[a]	15	30	50	4	6	67	No	PROGRAM DISCONTINUED ON 5/12 - TUTOR'S REQUEST									No	Yes	Study Club for Low Achievers
PS 3	15	31	48	7	15	47	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	3	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	
PS 4	9	26	35	5	8	63	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	1	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	
PS 5[c]	10	13	77	4	13	31	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Tchr's Room	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
PS 6	13	32	41	3	13	23	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Lunch Room	No	No	No	No	Yes	
PS 7	16	22	73	5	15	33	Tchr	Yes	No	No	No	No	Aud.	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Available Classrooms Also Used
PS 8	10	27	37	4	10	40	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Lib.	No	No	No	No	Yes	
JHS 2		CLASS NOT HELD AS SCHEDULED																	
JHS 3	5	36	14	NONE USED				No[b]	No	No	No	No	1	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Regular Lesson Presented
PS 9	6	23	26	9	11	82	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	1	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	
PS 10	28	31	90	9	15	60	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Lunch Room	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Outside Disturbance Evident
Total	153	332	46	63	132	48													

[a] Information based on interview with Assistant Principal

[b] Left at beginning of May

tivity was alternate reading aloud by the pupils to the tutors in groups of two or three pupils to one tutor. Rapport between the pupils and the tutors seemed good as was evidenced by a good deal of touching and smiling encouragement. Most classes used Reader's Digest reading materials.

The educational assistant seemed,in most classes observed,to have but one function - paper work. They generally sat in one place and did not move through the class. They recorded the attendance of both the pupils and the tutors and occasionally questioned the tutors regarding the whereabouts of the absent tutees. Few of them actually worked with the children during the classes observed.

The teachers moved about from group to group, listening and suggesting once the class began. During the "settling-down" time they assigned pupils to tutors when their regular tutor was absent. Occasionally, when the pupil-tutor ratio was too high, a teacher would work with a group. When this happened, the difference between a tutor (untrained) and a trained teacher was quite apparent - the teacher sought to help the children generalize while the tutors dealt only with correcting particular errors. Although the tutors seemed generally to be brimming over with good will, their lack of training was evident.

Spring 1974 scores on the MAT were used as pre-program measures of reading levels and Spring 1975 scores on the New York City tests were used as post-program measures. A conversion table was provided by the Board of Education to equate the measures, and a predicted post-test mean was computed for each grade utilizing the historical regression procedure. The predicted post-means and the observed post-means were compared, using correlated $\underline{t}$ tests. The results of these analyses appear in Table 2.

Table 2

Summary of Pre, Predicted Post, and Observed Post Program Reading Grade Equivalents by Grade: Tutorial Program

Grade	N	Pretest Mean	Pretest S.D.	Predicted Posttest Mean	Predicted Posttest S.D.	Observed Posttest Mean	Observed Posttest S.D.	*t*
2	13	2.45	0.43	CANNOT BE COMPUTED		3.55	1.04	4.345**
3	38	2.35	0.41	2.89	0.58	3.00	0.59	1.260
4	66	2.80	0.57	3.27	0.72	3.61	1.09	2.448*
5	69	3.86	0.87	4.43	1.04	5.04	1.07	5.890**
6	33	4.82	1.10	5.45	1.26	5.88	1.49	1.992*
7	28	5.75	1.07	6.35	1.22	6.28	1.66	0.308
8	11	6.19	1.04	6.75	1.16	7.34	1.16	1.583
9	22	5.72	1.47	6.12	1.63	6.96	1.67	2.150*
Total	280							

*Significant at .05 level
**Significant at .01 level

Inspection of Table 2 indicates that the children in grades 2, 4, 5, 6, and 9 seemed to have shown a statistically significant reading improvement. While participants in grades 3, 7 and 8 demonstrated gains in reading achievement, the differences between predicted and observed posttest means were not statistically significant over that predicted. It should be pointed out, however, that the standard deviations at every grade level are larger on the post-test scores than they are on either the pre- or predicted post scores. Further, careful review of the pretest means indicates that, except for grade 2, children were chosen for the program who were indeed ½ to two years behind in reading.

B. Teacher Training Component

In an effort to evaluate the Innovative Teaching Program, interviews were held with the program's coordinator and with a randomly chosen sample of eight teachers in eight different schools. In addition, curriculum materials generated by the program were reviewed. The eight teachers were asked the following questions: (1) "Have you ever been involved in this program? If the answer is yes, what are your thoughts on it?" Of the eight interviewed, two were or had been involved. Of the two, one thought the monthly meetings were "boring" and reported that to (her, his) knowledge, the materials developed were not used in (her,his) school. The reported that the program was good, that (he,she) had used curriculum guides, and that they were available in the school's library, and they were used by other teachers "on occasion."

(2) "If you have never been involved in the program, have you ever heard of it, used the materials generated by it yourself, or known of any teacher that has used these materials?" Four teachers indicated that they had never used any of the materials themselves. Two did not know any other teacher that had used the materials either, but two did know of some who had. The remaining two teachers never heard of the program.

While the results of these interviews are certainly not conclusive, they do tend to bear out the concerns of the program's coordinator, i.e., that although the developed curriculum materials could be useful, especially to beginning teachers, the delivery system for them was weak, and dependent upon the interest and enthusiasm of not only the participating teacher but also of the individual building principal. It seems fair to assume that the number of children who benefitted from this program was much less than was desired.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Future Teachers (Tutorial Component)

Because the program seems instrumental in raising the reading level of its participants beyond the level of chance, it should be continued. Additional recommendations are made on the assumption that it will be continued.

1. Plans to carry out all administrative procedures for tutors at one time, in one place should be implemented.

2. Because the interest of teachers, tutors and pupils seems to wane once spring testing has been concluded, consideration should be given to holding three weekly classes and ending the program in May. This might also minimize the effect of the closing of community centers which jeopardized the program this year.

3. Because the teachers are trained and the tutors are not, it would seem to be more effective if the teachers moved more from group to group, and the tutors reviewed what the teachers did. The educational assistants could provide more help during the "settling-down" period, and return to their paper work while the teachers, pupils, and tutors are at work.

4. Future evaluations might want to study the effect that participation has on the tutors, e.g. does their school work or self-esteem improve?

B. Teacher Training Component

Unless some steps are taken to improve the efficiency of the delivery system for developed curriculum materials, the program should be eliminated. These steps might include (a) the recruitment of teacher participants who are demonstrated leaders in their own schools, and who themselves are enthusiastic about it, and (b) the involving of the building principals, whose cooperation is essential for the program to function. The principals might be involved in the development and circulation of the curriculum jobs.

VI. SUMMARY

This evaluation has described the objectives and implementation of a tutorial reading program and an innovative teaching program in District 18 of New York City. The evaluation consisted of classroom observations, interviews, and analyses of pre and post-program reading scores. These analyses indicated that the reading level of the pupils in grades 2, 4, 5, 6, and 9 who were involved in the tutorial program seemed to improve beyond the level predicted by historical regression. Thus, it is recommended that this program be continued, although some suggestions for improvement are made.

Interview data seemed to corroborate an impression gained through discussion and observation that the delivery system for curriculum guides, developed in the innovative teaching program, was ineffective. Unless this delivery system can be improved, it is recommended that the program be discontinued.

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Final Report
July, 1975

Function No. 20-53411

EVALUATION OF CITY-WIDE UMBRELLA PROGRAMS

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

1974 - 1975 SCHOOL YEAR

"EDUCATION IN ACTION"

Prepared by: Michael L. Berger

I. INTRODUCTION

Education in Action, formerly known as the School Community Neighborhood Center, had as its main goal the development of better understanding of the adverse effects of venereal disease, cancer, alcoholism, narcotics abuse, and other health problems. Students and parents in Community School Districts 3, 4, and 5 were the target group. The Program employed a series of films, workshops, and "rap" sessions to accomplish its aims. These activities were held in the participating schools, usually as part of ongoing courses such as hygiene and physical education or parent association programs.

For students, Education in Action developed an educational "cycle" which was normally sequenced over a period of from four to six weeks. The same group was exposed, in turn, to information concerning venereal disease, cancer, alcohol, and drug education. At the end of the cycle, the Program staff began anew with another group. It should be noted that the Education in Action staff worked simultaneously on several cycles in different schools throughout the districts. The adult workshops, which generally resulted from community requests, consisted of single, unrelated sessions.

Instruction for the student sessions was normally carried on by the Program staff, although the regularly assigned classroom teacher was usually present. This latter situation improved the chances for later follow-through by the regular teacher when the Education in Action presentations had been completed.

The adult workshops were conducted by specialists from cooperating civic agencies, such as local hospitals, blood programs, and medical schools. A guest presentation was usually followed by a question and answer period. These sessions were normally held in the "family room" of the host school and refreshments were provided.

II. EVALUATION DESIGN

The evaluation design for the Education in Action program was based primarily on the results of written questionnaires, which were developed initially by the Program staff for each of the content areas. A "pre-test" was administered to participants immediately preceding the activities for that session. The same instrument was then re-administered as a "post-test" at the end of the session. In addition, an informal attempt was made to elicit feedback from adults, students, and cooperating teachers regarding the relative worth of each session and of the total program.

While the basic evaluation design remained unchanged throughout the year, the questionnaires were substantially modified in the spring. As indicated, the original instruments had been written by the Program staff. Since the evaluator was not appointed until mid-winter, it was decided to accept the results of these questionnaires for the first half of the year, while at the same time studying the instruments for possible revision.

Unfortunately, the original questionnaires were deemed inadequate, necessitating the creation of new ones in the spring. Improvements incorporated in the new instruments included: (1) an increase in the number of questions to a uniform eighteen - there had been from ten to seventeen questions on the original instruments, with the mean being eleven. The chances of obtaining statistically reliable results were thereby enhanced; (2) the reading level and phraseology of the questions were modified to minimize language comprehension difficulties and provide parallel syntax; (3) the disproportionate number of times that "true" was the correct response was rectified by creating a more even "true/false" distribution of correct answers; and (4) provision was made to add the classification "Do Not Know" as a possible response to all questions. This effectively eliminated the earlier "forced-choice" situation, which probably inaccurately measured the true content knowledge of the participants.

As a result of these changes in the written instruments, two different types of inferential data analysis were undertaken. For both the original and revised questionnaires, pre- and post-test scores were to be compared utilizing a correlated t test, with the minimum level of significance set at .05. In the case of those revised questionnaires for which only post-test scores were available (due to the late introduction of the former), the number of items answered correctly by each participant and the overall percentage of correct items was determined. The criterion for program success was set at seventy-five per cent of the participants attaining a mastery of sixty-five percent of the items.

III. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The Program was housed in two adjoining rooms in Public School 149 (Manhattan). The Project Coordinator, the family workers, and a secretary made efficient use of the space provided, and it seemed adequate for the functions that were performed there. The Program's activities in the field involved the use of school classrooms and auditoriums, and these facilities varied in quality depending on the school. However, based on observations, all were adequate.

It was obvious that the Project Coordinator and his teaching staff of three family workers understood the objectives of the program, were dedicated to what they were doing, and worked well together. The Program team arranged a significant number of sessions throughout the year. Furthermore, there was a definite concern on the part of the staff regarding the effectiveness of the sessions. This was seen in (1) the time and effort expended in obtaining and reviewing an impressive array of materials; (2) the creation of a list of community services and agencies that supplied materials and guest speakers; (3) the development of prototypic lesson plans for three of the content areas - these lesson plans provided a certain degree of consistency from one session to another, without unduly structuring each one; and (4) the willingness with which the Program Coordinator adopted new session topics to meet the needs and desires of the community.

The Program established effective and cordial contacts with selected schools within the districts covered. School administrators and drug coordinators were pleased that the Program was in their schools, and teacher requests that the cycle be repeated with other classes were not uncommon. One measure of the effectiveness of Education in Action was that it served as a type of resource center, loaning materials and suggesting speakers to those schools not participating directly in the Program.

Besides the expertise of the family workers who conducted most of the sessions, the Program relied heavily on films and printed materials provided by public and private community organizations. These materials were generally supplied without cost, although occasionally films were rented or purchased outright. The literature and films varied in quality, but were probably the best that could have been obtained, given the fact that only a small percentage of the budget was allocated for the purchase and/or rental of such materials.

There was one major deviation from the original Program proposal. While the Program was always concerned with such health questions as venereal disease, alcoholism, and drug abuse, the initial thrust was aimed at the last one. In fact, one aspect of the program proposal asked that the evaluation design incorporate a comparison of drug arrests between those exposed to the Program and a control group. However, the focus of Education in Action changed during the summer of 1974. Community and school feedback indicated a dramatic rise in venereal disease and alcoholism among teenagers. In addition, it proved impossible or impractical to obtain police records of individual drug arrests. Therefore, the emphasis of the Program was widened to give equal attention to all content areas.

Several minor changes were also made. The Program office was relocated in November of 1974 from 501 West 125th Street, Manhattan, to Public School 149 (Manhattan). This move was made possible by the good relations that had been established between the Project Coordinator and the P.S. 149 administration. This change was a wise one for several reasons. First, it gave the Program a location more central relative to the schools being served. Second, P.S. 149 was physically linked with another elementary school, P.S. 207, thus minimizing the time and effort necessary to service the latter. Third, the relocation made more visible the Program's relationship to the school system, distinguishing it from other civic agencies.

Another modification was in the designation of this component. The original name, which failed to really differentiate the component from others in the City-wide Umbrella Program, was changed to the more unique and dynamic-sounding Education in Action.

The range and focus of operation for the Program was also altered somewhat. It was felt that the SPARK Drug Program at George Washington High School (Manhattan) was successful, and that Education in Action's presence there would be unnecessarily duplicative. Therefore, that school was dropped from the Program, and Public School 156 (Manhattan) was substituted. (The parents of children in the latter institution had requested affiliation with the Program.) This change allowed Education in Action to concentrate and refine their activities on the elementary and junior high school level, since George Washington had been the only high school serviced. As a result of this change, however, the Program no longer had any participating schools in District 6. One other modification was the substitution of Junior High School 43M for 13M. The latter left because of organizational problems.

Finally, the Program staff is to be commended for the introduction of workshops in the areas of breast cancer, hypertension, and sickle cell anemia; as well as the sponsoring of a two-day bloodmobile program. All were initiated in response to an analysis of community needs.

The Education in Action Program, then, was an active and seemingly effective one. The sessions that were held directly pertained to the program objectives. The Project Coordinator and his teaching staff understood their community; related well to administrators, teachers, students, and themselves; and were able to locate and tap civic agencies for supporting materials and speakers.

IV. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

The grant proposal submitted by Education in Action specified that the primary evaluation criterion would be pre- and post-test scores on content questionnaires. Data relative to this criterion are assembled in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1

Comparison of Scores on Content Questionnaires Administered to Adults

	Number of Items	N	Correct	S.D.	t
Alcoholism					
Pre-test	10	45	9.16	2.37	
Post-test	10	45	10.29	1.67	2.60*
Cancer					
Pre-test	17	45	13.91	2.44	
Post-test	17	47	15.36	1.00	3.66*
Drug Abuse					
Pre-test	10	35	8.66	1.64	
Post-test	10	35	9.40	.93	2.30*
Hygiene					
Pre-test	10	35	9.66	.53	
Post-test	10	35	9.57	.80	0.52
Venereal Disease					
Pre-test	13	42	11.48	1.38	
Post-test	13	40	12.28	1.00	2.97*

NOTE: The negative t value indicated that the posttest mean was less than the Pretest mean.
$^*p < .01$

An analysis of Table 1 reveals that the adult workshops recorded statistically significant positive results in all but one of the content areas in which questionnaires were administered. (It should be noted that the revised instruments were introduced too late in the year to be employed with the adult workshops. This situation was compounded by the fact that the late spring sessions tended to be in the content areas recently added to the program, for which no evaluative instruments existed.) Since the method of presentation was similar in all cases, possible explanations for the variable success might be: (1) differences in the quality of the presentations; (2) the level of prior knowledge that participants brought to each content area; (3) questionnaires that were not valid and/or reliable; and (4) fluctuations in the interest level of each content area to the participants. The data does not allow for conclusive statements in this regard. However, the above discussion should not distract from the overwhelming success of the Program in working with adults in the five major content areas.

Table 2

Comparative Scores on Content Questionnaires Administered to Students

	Number of Items	N	Mean Number Correct	S.D.	t
Alcoholism					
Pre-test	10	71	9.10	1.25	
Post-test	10	97	9.33	1.06	1.26
Alcoholism					
Pre-test	18	37	10.97	2.02	
Post-test	18	42	13.83	1.93	6.34*
Cancer					
Pre-test	10	61	9.10	1.00	
Post-test	10	40	9.45	0.80	1.93
Cancer					
Pre-test	18	67	15.07	1.08	
Post-test	18	65	15.35	1.39	1.28
Drug Abuse					
Pre-test	10	218	8.44	1.36	
Post-test	10	100	8.40	1.13	0.28
Drug Abuse					
Pre-test	18	29	12.90	3.40	
Post-test	18	28	16.46	1.32	5.17*
Hygiene					
Pre-test	10	98	9.07	1.26	
Post-test	10	78	9.28	1.00	1.23
Venereal Disease					
Pre-test	10	74	7.35	1.37	
Post-test	10	82	7.59	1.34	1.07
Venereal Disease					
Pre-test	18	49	16.82	0.48	
Post-test	18	35	15.54	1.48	-4.84*

NOTE: The negative t values indicated that the posttest means were less than the pretest means.

*$p < .01$

Table 2 presents similar data for student participants in the Education in Action programs. In four of the five content areas, a comparison was possible between scores on the original and revised questionnaires. Only in the area of hygiene is this not possible. While the student results are not as impressive as those involving adults, the Program must still be judged moderately successful in two of the content areas, alcoholism and drugs. Statistically significant positive results were obtained on one questionnaire in each of these two content areas. The least successful aspect of the Program was clearly that concerned with venereal disease, where the revised questionnaire revealed a significant loss from pre-test to post-test.

The explanations offered above to explain the variations in the Program effectiveness for adults also apply in the case of the students. In addition, it should be noted that in the case of the alcoholism, drug and venereal questionnaires, large variations exist in the results obtained when using the revised instruments as opposed to the original ones. In view of the greater number of items, the revised questionnaires are the more reliable of the two. Thus, the fact that statistically significant gains were evidenced in the revised alcohol and drug questionnaires is encouraging. However, the negative finding on the revised venereal disease questionnaire cannot be ignored. It is difficult to understand how Education in Action could be so successful in other areas and yet have such negative results here. Possibly, this particular questionnaire is unreliable in some respect. It should be subjected to thorough analysis and evaluation before being used again. However, these aberrant results should not obscure the generally positive nature of the findings.

In one case, data was available only for the post-test administration of a questionnaire. These statistics are also unique in another aspect, in that they involve junior high school students, whereas the data contained in Table 2 was for elementary school students. An examination of Table 3 reveals that for this particular group the level of mastery specified in the evaluation design - seventy-five per cent of the participants attaining sixty-five per cent of the items - was not achieved. Only thirty-two per cent of the participants scored at the mastery level. Without additional statistics from the junior high school population, it is difficult to conclude whether the Program is really less successful with this age group than with younger children. Further testing in this area is advised in the future.

Table 3

Distribution of Post-Test Scores on the Revised Drug Questionnaire
Administered to Eighth Grade Students

No. Correct	f	Cummulative f	%f	Cummulative %f
16	3	3	.06	6
15	3	6	.06	12
14	5	11	.10	22
13	5	16	.10	32
12	5	21	.10	42
11	5	26	.10	52
10	3	29	.06	58
9	4	33	.08	66
8	8	41	.16	82
7	7	48	.14	96
5	1	49	.02	98
3	1	50	.02	100

Education in Action also indicated in their grant proposals that they would evaluate the response of the participants. However, no systematic attempt was made to collect the reactions of either the adult or student populations. Based on the evaluator's observations, the motivation and interest level of the adults was high. Attendance was good to excellent, and often included many school faculty members who elected to spend a conference or lunch period in the workshop. (In the latter respect, it could be argued that Education in Action provided in-service education to these teachers.)

Observations of the student population presented mixed results. When the cooperating teacher actively assisted the family workers, the students were quiet and appeared to be interested in, and affected by, the presentation. However, when the family workers were left on their own, they frequently had difficulty controlling the students and/or keeping them interested in the session activities.

V. PROGRAM STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

In conclusion, several qualitative strengths of the Program deserve mention. First, the Project Coordinator was well-qualified for his position, and offered the Program an apparent expertise in management skills. In addition, he constantly sought ways to improve the program, especially through the addition of new subject workshops and materials. Finally, due to his relatively long tenure with the Program, the Project Coordinator brought a significant amount of experience to the job, which undoubtedly prevented much waste in the expenditure of time and effort.

Second, the Project Coordinator and his teaching staff established excellent rapport with the school administrators, drug coordinators, and teachers with whom they cooperated. This was evidenced by both the letters of thanks and those requesting services that they received. Third, the Program's success gave it a certain amount of visibility. Thus, Education in Action frequently received requests from people within and without the community for information regarding the availability of certain presentations, printed materials, and films.

The only apparent weakness in the Program seems to be in the methodology of student instruction. Based on observations, it would appear that the pedagogical strategies and techniques being employed could be improved. (See Recommendation No. 3 below for a further elaboration on this point.)

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following suggestions should be interpreted as ways that Education in Action might strengthen an already relatively successful program:

1. In addition to the questionnaires that test knowledge acquisition, some attempt should be made to systematically sample the adults, students and cooperating teachers for their opinions of each presentation, or at least the cycle as a whole. This would provide a second measure of effectiveness for the program.

2. A more structured "follow-up" system ought to be instituted for the student workshops, whereby Education in Action personnel and participating teachers would cooperate to reinforce Program learnings after the formal presentations have ended.

3. While some attempt has been made to train the family workers for their instructional tasks, further improvement seems necessary regarding methodology. Since the teaching staff are committed to the Program and desirous of succeeding, these attitudes should be capitalized on by further training in questionning techniques, motivation, concept development, and inquiry procedures.

4. Since this component performs a similar function to others in the City-wide Umbrella Program, attempts should be made to visit and observe the operation of these units. This would allow for a greater sharing of information and resources, and prevention of unnecessary duplication of effort.

5. The Program staff should continue its efforts to develop materi-

als on a reading level commensurate with student abilities. Since the interim report, some progress in this area has been noted.

6. Some attempt should be made to determine whether the small group workshop is the most effective method of instruction in each of the content areas, and equally valid for adults and students. If possible, the importance of audio-visual presentations and/or distribution of printed literature should also be determined.

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Final Report
July, 1975

Function No. 20-53412

EVALUATION OF CITY-WIDE UMBRELLA PROGRAMS

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

1974 - 1975 SCHOOL YEAR

"BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL PROGRAM"

Prepared by: Richard E. Baecher

I. INTRODUCTION

The Bilingual-Bicultural Program, in its first year of implementation in Community School District 12, sought to instruct Spanish-speaking pupils in a second language (English), and to reduce scholastic retardation in the participating students by providing instruction in Spanish as they were acquiring basic English language skills. Additionally, the Program aimed to augment their reading levels in English.

The Bilingual-Bicultural Program was organized in grades one through six. One hundred and sixty-two (162) students who received a rating of CDEF on the Scale for Rating Pupil's Ability to Speak English participated in the Program. An experienced, bilingual TESL teacher coordinated the specialized activities of ten bilingual paraprofessionals. The TESL coordinator met with each paraprofessional bi-weekly from 2:00 to 3:00 P.M. for problem-solving workshops, demonstration lessons, and materials development activities.

The bilingual paraprofessionals, the majority of Puerto Rican background, served as an articulation link between the individual teachers, the coordinator, and the parents. Eight of these paraprofessionals worked in the classroom and directly reinforced the lessons being taught in English and Spanish. The remaining two paraprofessionals, particularly skilled in TESL activities, worked directly with the TESL coordinator.

The TESL teacher, sharing a room wherein another program was functioning, enthusiastically carried out the following responsibilities: (1) coordination and realization of Program objectives; (2) in-service training of bilingual paraprofessionals; (3) planning of enrichment activities for children; and (4) orientation sessions with parents. The bilingual paraprofessionals, in addition to giving small group instruction, provided the target students with a glimpse of Hispanic culture and expanded the children's oral and written expression through language development exercises and related activities. They worked closely with their assigned regular teachers and planned cooperatively with them in all content and academic skills areas.

II. EVALUATION DESIGN

In order to determine the degree to which the Bilingual-Bicultural Program met its objectives of: (1) providing instruction in English to Spanish dominant pupils; (2) reinforcing concepts in Spanish; (3) increasing their reading skills in English; and (4) ascertaining the effectiveness of selected aspects of the Program, e.g. bilingual personnel involvement, the following evaluation procedures were employed:

1. Observation of the On-Going Program

Formal and informal classroom observations were conducted for six days throughout the school year. Each bilingual paraprofessional was observed and interviewed along with the TESL coordinator and a sampling of regular teachers.

2. Analysis of Official Records and Materials

Various commercial and staff produced materials and equipment employed in the Program, letters and bulletins distributed to parents regarding the Program, official records of pupils, currently used diagnostic instruments, attendance rolls, etc. were inspected.

3. Analysis of Test Results

Pupil performance data on selected subtests of the Inter-American Series Tests of Reading in English, and data derived from the English version of the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts, were analyzed to evaluate any increase in basic reading skills and concept attainment of the participating youngsters.

4. Analysis of Data Yielded From:

   (a) Questionnaire - Paraprofessional Involvement and Training Program - designed to yield information concerning the perceptions of the bilingual personnel and their roles.

   (b) Scale for Rating Pupil Attitudes to Self and School - designed to collect information from the regular teachers concerning their perceptions of change in attitude on the part of the target population.

The data from these instruments were analyzed to supplement the test results yielded from the Inter-American Series and the Boehm Test. Information in the form of qualitative data on the perceptions of the bilingual paraprofessionals and teachers was gathered by means of these rating scales and questionnaire.

III. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Staffing/Activities

The TESL teacher worked out of a room that served as the focus of the Program. In addition to instructing small groups averaging five pupils on a daily basis in English as a second language, the TESL coordinator conducted workshops and training sessions for the bilingual paraprofessionals. The latter activities occurred between 2:00 and 3:00

P.M. and were attended by three paraprofessionals for each hour to allow for close contact and guidance.

Eight bilingual paraprofessionals instructed small groups of designated target pupils in regular classrooms. Among the varied and numerous activities observed directly and described in their "paraprofessional weekly logs," these were noted: (1) assisting students in the spelling of English words; (2) reinforcing their efforts in cursive writing; (3) teaching reading skills by means of the language experience approach and phonics method; (4) developing oral/aural language skills; (5) providing tutorial help in mathematics; (6) emphasizing important cultural aspects in social studies; (7) enhancing the self concept of the pupils through special assistance; and (8) planning and encouraging cognitive and language development through varied activities and enriching field trips. These were only a few of the varied educational activities engaged in by the paraprofessionals in collaboration with their regular teachers.

The two other paraprofessionals worked directly with the coordinator and serviced children biweekly in groups of four, for periods of fifty minutes. A multi-dimensional approach was employed in the room, including use of audio-visual aids, materials stressing oral language development skills, as well as teacher and paraprofessional made materials aimed at fostering each child's needs and abilities.

In sum, the specific pattern whereby bilingual personnel served as an important link between the target children, the regular teachers and the TESL coordinator was operationally sound, representing a necessary adaptation of the traditional "pull-out" English as a Second Language Program. Through the dedication and cooperativeness of the ten bilingual paraprofessionals, as manifested in their conversations, instructional activities and the individual diagnostic packets for each target pupil, the Program proved to be an imaginative response to a serious educational challenge.

Materials/Equipment

In that part of the room designated for the Bilingual-Bicultural Program, these sets of materials were utilized: (1) *SRA Language Development Program*; (2) *Oral English: Language Skills Text* (available on tape cassettes also); (3) *Merrill Linguistic Readers*; (4) *Puerto Rico en Mi Corazon*; (5) *English in Action*; (6) *Teaching English as a Second Language*; (7) *Learning English as a Second Language*.

These materials were supplemented by teacher and paraprofessional made materials that dealt with specific language skills. The latter were inspected and were of superior quality. Sets of language masters and other educational hardware were utilized adequately in the Program.

Another indicator of the Program's major strengths was the presence in the room of a "culture corner," a table pleasantly decorated with various books on the cultural heritage of the target population. These books were made available to the pupils and were used by the bilingual paraprofessionals for lesson plans. Finally, large sized photographs showing the staff working with the children were displayed on the closet door.

IV. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Data pertaining to the effectiveness of selected aspects of the Program were gathered from regular teachers and bilingual paraprofessionals. Specially prepared rating scales and questionnaires were administered to all the participating staff.

1. Analysis of Rating Scale Results

Teachers' perceptions of change in pupil attitudes toward self and school were collected from an informal instrument entitled "Scale for Rating Pupil Attitudes to Self and School." (See Appendix A for copy of rating scale). The purpose of the instrument was to ascertain any change in target student attitude from the viewpoint of the regular teachers directly involved in the program. It was reasoned that the perceptions of the regular teachers would form an appropriate basis to identify any significant changes in pupils' attitudes toward self and school as a result of the Program.

Table 1 presents the cumulative frequencies and means of the target groups in grades 1-6.

Table 1

Proportions and Means of Target Population in Grades 1-6
Within Categories of "Pupil Attitudes to Self and School"

Grade	Unit of Time	0-1	2	3	4	5	N	Max. Dif. Obs.	Max. Dif. Exp.	Means
First	Prior*	5	3	8	5	2	23	6	9	2.8
	Now**	4		5	11	3	23			3.4
Second	Prior	1	3	5	5	4	18	1	8	3.4
	Now		3	5	6	4	18			3.6
Third	Prior	4	13	1	1	1	20	9	8***	2.2
	Now	1	4	9	6		20			3.1
Fourth	Prior	1	7	10	6	4		7	10	3.2
	Now	1	5	5	13	7	28			3.9
Fifth	Prior	2	5	6	9	3	25	1	9	2.2
	Now	1	4	8	8	4	25			2.3
Sixth	Prior	3	5	6	8	1	23	3	7	2.9
	Now	2	4	6	7	4	23			3.4

*Prior to program; **Present; ***Significant at the .03 level

Based upon the application of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Two-Sample Test statistic, a significant difference was noted among third grade teachers. They perceived significant changes in pupil attitudes toward self and school. It can be reasonably asserted that this difference was due to the Program design. Although significant differences were not found among the other grades, an inspection of the means (Prior-Now) of Table 1 indicates a positive direction in all instances. It should be noted that all the scores in the "now" classification fall in the "average change" category.

2. Analysis of Questionnaire Results

The involvement of the bilingual paraprofessionals was an important ingredient in the entire Program. Data concerning the degree of their involvement were derived from an informal questionnaire designed to tap their education and experience, and their perceptions of the Program. Table 2 presents the responses to some of the items on the questionnaire.

Table 2

Responses of Bilingual Paraprofessionals to Questionnaire

1. How many years of school have you completed?

   1 - completed some high school
   2 - had a high school diploma
   4 - had completed some college work
   1 - had a degree from a two-year college

2. Are you currently attending school?

   5 - yes; 4 - no

3. How many years of experience have you had as an educational assistant or a teacher aide, not counting this year?

   Median years: 3

Table 2 (cont.)

4. What do you think might be the most important ways in which you will help the teacher in the class? A sampling of responses included:

    a. reinforcing content area matter and skills given by the teacher;
    b. assisting the teacher communicate with bilingual pupils;
    c. giving and correcting homework;
    d. help slower groups and learners in small groups;
    e. help teacher control.

5. What do you think will be the best things to happen in the classroom in which you spend the most time this year? Among the responses were:

    a. students improve scholastically;
    b. students achieve high level in all areas;
    c. students learn to read and behave;
    d. produce more material and realize own ideas;
    e. more time with target children.

6. What do you think will be the most important problems in the classroom in which you spend the most time? Some of the answers were:

    a. discipline and reading;
    b. limited space to move;
    c. interesting lessons;
    d. keeping the groups small;
    e. language problems.

7. What suggestions do you have for improving the program in this school this year? Some responses to this question were:

    a. time to prepare materials and lessons;
    b. more time to work with pupils;
    c. preparation periods with teachers;
    d. better screening.

Based upon the responses to this questionnaire, it can be concluded that the ten bilingual paraprofessionals represented an experienced and dedicated team of sensitive individuals who were receptive to continuous improvement.

3. Analysis of Test Results

Pupil performance data derived from the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts, English version, and from selected subtests of the Inter-American Series of Reading in English, were submitted to a pre-test and post-test analysis. A t test for correlated samples was applied to the correlated raw scores.

Table 3 presents the findings for the first grade on the Boehm Test.

Table 3

Pre-Test and Post-Test Performance
on Boehm Test of Basic Concepts - First Grade

Grade	N	Pre-Test		Post-Test		t
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1st	27	40.71	5.64	43.94	2.43	2.78*

*Significant at the .01 level

Table 4 summarizes the results of the Inter-American Test of Reading for grades 2-6.

Table 4

Pre-Test and Post-Test Performance
on Inter-American Test of Reading: Second to Sixth Grades

Grade	Test	Subtest	N	Pre-Test		Post-Test		t
				Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
2-3	R-1-DE	Vocabulary	33	24.54	7.60	31.36	6.08	7.63*
		Comprehension	32	20.40	8.22	26.66	6.73	5.51*
4	R-1-DE	Vocabulary	11	29.27	5.85	35.45	2.02	4.54*
		Comprehension	10	23.10	6.92	33.80	4.33	5.88*
4-6	R-2-DE	Reading Level	55	23.36	5.65	27.05	6.24	5.99*
		Vocabulary	55	25.75	6.30	28.01	6.32	4.04*

*Significant at the .01 level

It should be noted that Grades 2, 3 and some pupils in Grade 4 took Level 1 of the Inter-American Test; Level 2 was administered in Grades 4, 5, and 6. These levels were the most appropriate for these students.

Summary of Educational Test Data

Significant differences from pre-test to post-test were noted in all classes. The obtained differences were significant at the .01 level.

Based upon these findings, it is clearly evident that the Bilingual-Bicultural Program accomplished its objectives of providing instruction in English and increasing the students' reading skills in English.

V. PROGRAM STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Among the many strengths that stand out as characteristic of the Bilingual-Bicultural Program in District 12, these were the most important:

1. Experienced and dedicated bilingual personnel worked intensively with the target pupils in the Program. The utilization of these individuals as a link between the regular teachers, students and other staff members represented a significant and innovative program design.

2. The instructional use of the student's dominant language (Spanish) for purposes of concept reinforcement and greater comprehension reduced the language barrier of many pupils and fostered their conceptual development.

3. A wide variety of printed and audio materials and equipment for teaching English as a second language were available in the TESL component of the program. Intensive language development and enrichment activities, under the supervision of qualified bilingual personnel, were successfully implemented.

4. The willingness to cooperate with the bilingual paraprofessionals

and to increase the Program's impact manifested by the regular teachers was a highly positive feature.

5. The majority of the participating youngsters responded enthusiastically to the Program. It was evident that many pupils felt successful in their comprehension of content areas and reading skills. Additionally, their attitudes toward school and self increased positively as a result of the Program.

The Bilingual-Bicultural Program appeared to have certain weaknesses. These included:

1. Lack of adequate supply of materials that could be used for various content areas, especially for this group of students.

2. Insufficient communication among all the staff involved in the Program, especially the regular teachers. The latter represent an important source for suggestions to increase the effectiveness of the Program in the future.

3. Need for a more sensitive selection procedure and for an adjussive placement system, whereby students in need of this specialized service receive it throughout the duration of the Program.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Bilingual-Bicultural Program in District 12 was highly successful in increasing, to a significant degree, the bilingual abilities of the students participating in the Program. This Program, then, has given every indication of achieving its stated objectives. It well merits continued support in the future.

The following recommendations are submitted to the District for their consideration:

1. The involvement between Program staff and regular teachers of the target pupils should be fostered. An effort should be made to in-

crease communication among Program staff members and regular teachers. While it was evident that regular teachers are willing to cooperate more fully, a definite schedule of planned meetings would be helpful.

2. A system for more effective and sensitive selection of participating pupils, and for more flexible placement would do a good deal to enhance the Program. A possible direction might be greater emphasis upon a diagnostic-prescriptive approach.

APPENDIX A

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
School of Education
Institute for Research and Evaluation

SCALE FOR RATING PUPIL ATTITUDES TO SELF AND SCHOOL

Pupil's Name ________________________ Class _____ School ______________

Directions: Please rate the pupil whose name appears above on each item, first in terms of his attitude prior to participation in the special program for ESL students, and then in terms of present attitudes. Each item has two parts: Prior, Now. Circle the number 1 ("low rating") to 5 ("highest rating") to indicate your rating. 0 refers to "can't rate" and 3 stands for "average rating".

1.	Seems happy and relaxed.						
	Prior	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Now	0	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Gets along well with classmates.						
	Prior	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Now	0	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Seems to feel confident in his abilities						
	Prior	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Now	0	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Appears to take pride in his/her work.						
	Prior	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Now	0	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Cooperates with teachers, teacher assistants and pupils in working on class problems or projects						
	Prior	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Now	0	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Completes classwork and homework assignments.						
	Prior	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Now	0	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Controls inappropriate behavior.						
	Prior	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Now	0	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Pays attention to classroom activities.						
	Prior	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Now	0	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Appears to gain satisfaction from his work						
	Prior	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Now	0	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Participates enthusiastically in class activities.						
	Prior	0	1	2	3	4	5
	Now	0	1	2	3	4	5

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Final Report
July, 1975

Function No. 20-53413

EVALUATION OF CITY-WIDE UMBRELLA PROGRAMS

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

1974 - 1975 SCHOOL YEAR

"HELP-NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER PROGRAM"

Prepared by: Michael L. Berger

I. INTRODUCTION

The Help-Neighborhood Center Program, formerlly known as the School-Community Interaction Program-Communications No. 7, was designed primarily to provide educational services to the adult and student populations of Community School Districts 13 and 16. The Program consisted of a series of assemblies and discussion workshops held at cooperating elementary and junior high schools within the districts. The main objective of these assemblies and workshops was to increase knowledge and understanding in such content areas as: venereal disease; drug abuse; welfare rights; mental health; feminine hygiene; consumer affairs; alcoholism; child development; parent-child and peer group relationships; pupil records; and to increase parent communication with, and influence upon, the schools.

The Center basically served in a liaison capacity, linking community and school requests for information with local resource people and organizations able to provide it. Besides organizing the workshops and assemblies, the Center staff also generated interest in them by personally informing parents in their homes, when they brought their children to school, and by "flyers" sent out through the schools or parent organizations. The sessions were usually conducted by representatives from various private and public organizations, such as the United Parents Association and New York City Health Department. Members of the Center staff occasionally conducted workshops with students; though, here too, guest speakers were used.

II. EVALUATION DESIGN

The evaluation design for the Help Neighborhood Center Program initially involved three aspects. First, a written questionnaire was to be developed by the evaluator and the Center staff for each of the content areas listed above. This was to be administered to participants in each discussion workshop and assembly immediately preceding the activities for that session. The same instrument was then to be readministered immediately following the workshop. Second, a record was to be kept of the number of persons seeking the services of the Center and the number attending the individual workshop. Third, an informal attempt was to be made to elicit feedback from participants regarding their opinion of the relative worth of each session.

While the basic evaluation design remained unchanged throughout the year, the questionnaires were substantially modified in the spring. The original instruments had been written by the Center staff or by some of the private organizations that provided the guest presentations. Since the evaluator was not appointed until mid-winter, it was decided to accept the results of these questionnaires for the first half of the year, while at the same time studying the instruments for possible revision.

Unfortunately, the original questionnaires were deemed inadequate, necessitating the creation of new ones in the spring. Improvements incorporated in the new instruments included: (1) an increase in the number of questions to a uniform eighteen. (There had been from five to sixteen questions on the original instruments, with the mean being ten).

The chances of obtaining statistically reliable results was thereby enhanced; (2) the reading level and phraseology of the questions was modified to minimize language comprehension difficulties and provide parallel syntax; (3) the disproportionate number of times that "true" was the correct response was rectified by creating a more even "true/false" distribution of correct answers; and (4) provision was made to add the classification "Do Not Know" as a possible response to all questions. This effectively eliminated the earlier "forced-choice" situation, which probably inaccurately measured the true content knowledge of the participants.

As a result of these changes in the written instruments, two different types of inferential data analysis were employed. For the original questionnaires, pre and post scores of parents and students were compared utilizing a correlated $\underline{t}$ test, with the minimum level of significance set at .05. In the case of the revised questionnaires, the number of items answered correctly by each participant, and the overall percentage of correct items was determined. The criterion for program success was set at seventy-five percent of the participants attaining mastery of sixty-five percent of the items.

III. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

There were no major deviations from the program proposal, although several minor changes were implemented. The Center relocated in the fall of 1974 from 444 Sumner Avenue, Brooklyn, to its present location in Junior High School 258. This was a wise move since the Center retained its central location within the community, while at the same time enhancing its relationship to the school system. As mentioned earlier, another modification was the designation of this component. The original unwieldly title was changed to Help Neighborhood Center, a name more likely to be both remembered and accepted by the community. Finally, the range of operation for the Center was enlarged slightly. In addition to Districts

13 and 16, the adjoining District 32 was also serviced through contacts with one junior high and three elementary schools.

The Center operated out of a single room office in Junior High School 258 (Brooklyn). While the Coordinator and staff made effective use of the space available to them, conditions at best remained crowded within the office. On the other hand, the facilities within the cooperating schools were generally adequate, and sometimes superior. The practice of serving refreshments at the morning workshops helped to improve the ambiance, and created a family-like atmosphere.

The staff was badly hampered for the first half of the year by the lack of a typewriter and other supplies. Fortunately, this situation was rectified by mid-winter. However, the Center continued to lack duplicating equipment of its own because of the prohibitive cost of purchasing such equipment. The Center had to rely on the good will of the J.H.S. 258 administration for access to the latter's equipment. Thus, a considerable amount of unnecessary time and effort was expended on obtaining such services. It is a credit to the dedication of the Center staff that they were able to overcome these obstacles.

Based on assembly and workshop observations and interviews with the Center Coordinator and her staff of four, it would appear that the program was effectively implemented. All five staff members were extremely competent people who understood and applied the principles underlying the program, were dedicated to what they were doing, and worked well together. During the course of its ten month operation, the Center arranged an imppressive number and variety of activities (see Table 1 below). Furthermore, there was definite interest in the quality and effectiveness of the workshops. This was seen in (1) the provisions that were made for bilingual presentation (when necessary); and (2) the time and effort expended in previewing materials, especially films, used in the presentations.

The Center established effective contacts with well-established community agencies and associations. Relationships between them were cordial, and the cooperating services often took full responsibility for actually planning the workshops or assemblies.

The Center program employed a considerable amount of printed materials and films provided by public and private community organizations. These materials were supplied, generally without cost, by the same agencies that provided the guest speakers for the sessions. The literature and films varied in quality, but were probably the best that could have been obtained given the fact that there was no provision in the budget for the purchase of such materials. The materials were normally distributed as illustrative aids during the course of the assemblies and/or discussions, though on occasion they were used as the focus of the presentation.

Finally, the Center staff is to be commended for following through on two of the recommendations made by the evaluator in the interim report. Greater cooperation with other, similar City-Wide Umbrella Program components was evidenced, and was probably responsible for the introduction of at least one new content area into the Center's repertoire. Secondly, there was more efficient deployment of Center staff during the last half of the year, with the practice of all personnel attending each session eliminated.

The Center Program, then, was an active and expanding one. The sessions that were held related directly to the program objectives. The Coordinator and staff knew their community and became increasingly aware of the public and private resources they could draw upon.

IV. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

The grant proposal submitted by the Help Neighborhood Center specified as its first evaluation criterion the number of people "seeking services and attending workshops." Data relative to this criterion are assembled in Table 1. A total of seventy-two (72) workshops or assemblies were held from October to mid-June, with an attendance of 3,442 persons; 2,928 of whom were students. Several conclusions seem warranted by these statistics. First, the Center was extremely active in attempting

Table 1

Participation in Workshops and/or Assemblies: October-June

Topic	N	Total Attendance	Students	Adults
Drugs	17	506	506	0
Feminine Hygiene	12	550	530	20
Welfare Rights	7	74	0	74
Sex Education	5	140	140	0
Who Is Responsible?	5	128	0	128
Sickle Cell Anemia	4	487	450	37
Consumer Affairs	4	95	0	95
Physical Hygiene	3	345	345	0
Pupil Records	3	71	0	71
Communications	3	65	45	20
Venereal Disease	2	631	631	0
Alcoholism	2	35	0	35
Radiation	1	190	190	0
Lead Poisoning	1	61	61	0
Pollution	1	30	30	0
Community School Board Elections	1	24	0	24
Mental Health	1	10	0	10
TOTALS	72	3,442	2,928	514

to fulfill its mission. Approximately nine workshops were held each month, for an average of more than two a week. Second, the addition of certain topics to their list of presentations, specifically those of sickle cell anemia, radiation, lead poisoning, pollution, community school board elections and mental health, indicates that the Center was responsive to the needs of the adult community and the districts' school population. Third, the disproportionate number of workshops in each of the content areas also indicates that the Center served the needs of the community rather than its own predilections, if any. In this respect, it truly lived up to its designation as a "help" center. Fourth, while the majority of participants were overwhelmingly students (85%), the actual number of workshops/assemblies was more evenly divided between adults and pupils. In the fourteen content areas devoted exclusively to one of these two populations, seven were designed for adults and seven for students. Of these, thirty sessions were devoted to student interests and twenty-three to adult ones. The discrepancy in student/adult attendance is, therefore, more a function of the type of program offered (assemblies) than any bias toward either of the two populations served. Finally, while the data clearly indicates that the Center followed the dictates of its constituency, this may have indirectly reflected it away from one of its objectives. If the Center was designed to provide information in those areas of greatest social concern, then it is troubling to discover that only two workshops were offered on alcoholism, with a total attendance of 35, or one percent of the student population. The question may be raised as to whether the Center does not also have an obligation to lead, as well as follow, its constituency.

The Center also indicated in its proposal that they would evaluate the effectiveness of their program by the number of persons seeking services and the response of the participants. Judging from the letters made available to the evaluator, and the introduction of new workshop/assembly programs, it would appear that there was a significant demand for the services of the Center and that this increased as the year progressed. Thus, the Center was viewed by the community as a valuable resource to be tapped whenever practical.

Evaluating participant response is more difficult. No systematic attempt was made to collect the reactions of either the adult or student populations. Based on the evaluator's observations, the motivation and interest level of the adults was uniformly high. Given the time (early morning) and location (a public school) of the adult workshops, the attendance was good to excellent. Just as significantly, those who were present generally stayed until the end of the presentation, or made it clear that they had to leave due to other commitments.

Observations of the student population produced mixed reactions. Those presentations offered in small group workshops evidenced the same characteristics as the adult ones, with the obvious exception that the students were a "captive" audience. The assemblies, however, seemed to be less effective. Significant numbers of students seemed restless and inattentive. This, of course, it not a phenomenon unique to Center presentations, and may be due largely to the format employed. (In this regard, see Recommendation 3.)

The final evaluation criterion for the Center program called for the participants to "be able to identify behavior patterns that will help understand themselves, others, and their children." To this end, the evaluation design stipulated the administration of a questionnaire both before and after each presentation to determine whether increased knowledge had actually taken place, and if so, to what degree. Unfortunately, the Center staff elected to follow through in this regard in only a limited number of cases. Reference to Tables 1, 2 and 3 reveals that only 202 participants, out of a total population of 3,442 took any pretest. This represents less than 6 percent. In addition, testing was undertaken in only five of the seventeen areas in which workshops/assemblies were held. Finally, because no provision was made to identify the individual completing the questionnaire, it was impossible to do a correlated _t_ test on the data available. For these reasons, the results of the Center program, particularly as presented statistically in Table 2, must be termed inconclusive.

Table 2

Comparison of Scores on Content Questionnaires

	Number of Items	N	Mean Number Correct	S.D.	_t_
Alcoholism					
Pretest	5	10	3.60	0.80	
Posttest	5	10	3.60	1.10	0.00
Communications					
Pretest	6	6	4.00	1.15	
Posttest	6	5	5.00	0.00	1.94
Consumer Affairs					
Pretest	8	34	5.82	1.29	
Posttest	8	26	5.92	1.27	0.29
Venereal Disease					
Pretest	6	19	4.58	1.63	
Posttest	6	17	4.71	1.45	0.24
Welfare Rights					
Pretest	7	50	4.60	1.40	
Posttest	7	45	5.80	1.11	4.77*

*$p < .01$

However, certain observations may be made regarding the apparent implications of the data. First, it would appear that those workshops and assemblies that were offered had little or no effect on the participants. In only one case, that of the welfare rights questionnaire, were the results statistically significant, and here the population was only fifty persons. Since it was the evaluator's observation that the workshops/assemblies were generally informative and on the intelligence and interest level of those in attendance, a possible explanation for these relatively poor results may be the nature of the original instrument. In most cases, the number of items was so few that obtaining reliable results was all but precluded. In addition, while the guest presentations were valuable, little or no attempt was made to specifically apprise the guests of what was expected of them. Thus, the original questionnaire did not always parallel the material presented; i.e., they were not criterion-referenced examinations.

In this regard, it is interesting to note the results of the one revised questionnaire that was administered, that on drug abuse. The data from 83 participants is presented in Table 3. Unfortunately, only the posttest was given. However, it is significant that the level of mastery specified in the evaluation design - seventy-five per cent of the participants giving correct responses to sixty-five per cent of the items - was achieved. Assuming the validity of the instrument, this would seem to indicate that, at least in the area of student education in drug abuse, the Center program is achieving its objectives.

Table 3

Per Cent of Items Answered Correctly by Respondents
to Questionnaire on Drug Abuse

Per Cent Correct	N	Cummulative N	%N	Cummulative %N
Above 85	5	5	6	6
75 - 84	26	31	31	37
65 - 74	32	63	39	76
Below 65	20	83	24	100

V. PROGRAM STRENGTHS

In conclusion, several qualitative strengths of the program deserve mention. First, the ability and dedication of the coordinator and her staff were uniformly high. They brought an apparent expertise in management skills to the project, as well as a thorough knowledge of the community in which they work. Second, there was a needed flexibility to the program, which allowed the Center to adapt to the information needs of their constituency. Third, the Center Coordinator and staff established excellent rapport with the school administrations and public and private agencies with which it cooperated. Just as significantly, the program personnel showed an ability to select agencies that were both capable of high quality presentations and active within the community. Finally, both the Center staff and the guest speakers seemed aware and capable of producing the "home" atmosphere necessary to help parents relax in what may be an "alien" institution for them.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following suggestions are designed to help provide the quantitative data to support what appears by observation to be a successful, quality program:

1. Greater effort must be made to administer the various questionnaires to all program participants, especially the students. If reading problems make this difficult, the questions might be administered orally, with pupils simply marking one of the three boxes next to the pertinent number. This recommendation was also made in the interim report, but appears to have gone unheeded.

2. In addition to questionnaires which test knowledge acquisition, some attempt should be made to systematically sample the participant's opinions of the presentation itself. This would provide a second measure of the effectiveness of the workshop and/or assembly.

3. When enough questionnaires have been completed to yield reliable results, this data should be used to ascertain what type of format (assembly, small group workshop, a combination of the two, etc.) is most effective for each of the content areas. If possible, the importance of audio-visual presentations and/or the distribution of printed literature should also be determined.

4. Guest speakers should be apprised of the specific objectives of the Center program in their area. One means of doing this might be to show and discuss the pertinent questionnaire with them.

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

---

inal Report
uly, 1975

Function No. 20-53414

EVALUATION OF CITY-WIDE UMBRELLA PROGRAMS

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

1974 - 1975 SCHOOL YEAR

"STUDENT PROGRESS REPORTER CORPS"

Prepared by: Leonard P. Stocker

I. INTRODUCTION

The program, "Student Progress Reporter Corps," was in operation during the 1974-1975 school year in four public schools of New York City. Three of these schools were located in Manhattan's Community School District 3, while the fourth school was in Community School District 23 of Queens.

Directly involved in the program were 420 children in grades two to six whose reading scores were found to be considerably below the mean for their grade. In many cases this was two or more years. A remedial program was introduced to bring about an improvement in the children's reading skills. In two of the schools in the program some of the materials provided through Student Progress Reporter Corps funding were made available to children other than those directly participating in the project.

The program had as its primary objective the raising, to a statistically significant degree, of the reading achievement scores of the pupil participants. Another objective of the program was to increase the children's motivation.

The desired improvements were to be brought about by means of special and intensified instruction provided by reading teachers aided by paraprofessionals, and through the use of special equipment (Betti-Kits and New Century Audio Access machines and materials).

The extent of the improvement in the children's reading skills was measured by the degree of the change that took place in pre- and post-treatment reading scores.

II. EVALUATION DESIGN

Visits to the four schools involved in the program were made by the evaluator during the school year for the purpose of observing the program in its day-to-day operations. On these occasions interviews were held with the principals of the four schools, several of the assistant principals, the coordinator of the program, the teachers of the children, the paraprofessionals involved in the project, as well as a sampling of the pupils in each school in order to obtain their reaction to the program in which they were participants.

Pertinent records of the project's coordinator and those of the four schools concerning the children in the program were readily made available to the evaluator, were examined by him, and found to be in good order.

The Spring 1974 MAT Reading Subtest Grade Equivalent Scores were used for the pre-treatment scores, while the Spring 1975 N.Y.C. Reading Comprehension Grade Equivalent Scores served as the post-treatment scores. The expected post-treatment scores were determined by historical regression analysis of the April, 1974 pre-treatment scores. The significance of differences between the expected and the actual achievement were determined by a correlated t test.

III. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The present project, supported through Umbrella funds, has completed its third year of operation. Participating in the program in the 1974-1975 school year were the following schools:

P.S. 107Q - 167th Street and 45th Avenue, Queens, District 25

P.S. 180M - 120th Street and Manhattan Avenue, Manhattan, District 3

P.S. 207M - 41 West 117th Street, Manhattan, District 3

P.S. 208M - 21 West 111th Street, Manhattan, District 3

For reasons which will be indicated below, two schools (that on Roosevelt Island and P.S. 113M) were not included in the present program.

The New Century System

Each of the children of District 3 participating in the program came for a period of 40 minutes daily to the special reading laboratory in each of the District's three participating schools to receive assistance in improving his reading skills. These three schools used the New Century Audio Write-and-See Instruction System. (B.F. Skinner, it may be noted in passing, served as advisor in the development of the New Century curriculum and materials.)

The New Century curriculum is designed to ensure the pupil's continuous progress and his daily success by the manner in which lessons are sequenced, coupled with a variety of highly motivating procedures together with additional reinforcement provided by the personal approval of the teacher and her aides. The program provides not only for continual diagnosis of the pupil's performance, but also prescribes specific instructions that will help overcome the child's particular problems. The system, in addition, also gives rise to immediate reinforcement of desired learning behaviors.

The New Century System is complete and comprehensive. It is geared to the development of the full range of reading skills - word attack, vocabulary, auditory and comprehension, as well as study skills.

Most of the materials, the teachers and children reported, were of a fairly high interest level. They were constructed in such a manner that correct responses were immediately reinforced. Diagnostic instruments for the measurement of reading deficiencies were incorporated into the program so that each child could be placed at an appropriate level and thereupon, at his own pace, follow a program that was largely individualized.

The system begins with the development of such pre-reading skills as visual and oral descrimination, the development of such concepts as sequence, size, and polarity. The child may then advance to decoding, and the establishment of sound-symbol correspondences between the printed and spoken words. Next, from simple words and sentences the child gradually progresses to ever more difficult sentences, paragraphs, and stories.

Two devices are used to individualize the teaching process: the Audio Frame and the Write-and-See systems.

The Audio Frame system is a cassette playback machine that is used with earphones. The machine is placed in a carrel which has sides and thus provides the pupil with a measure of privacy. The child receives specific and detailed instructions for each lesson through the headset. The machine then stops to provide the child with an opportunity to respond. When the child is ready for the next audio presentation, he presses a button on the machine and hears the next audio presentation, makes his next response, and so on until he completes the lesson.

Used in conjunction with the Audio Frame machine are the Write-and-See materials. When the teaching tape requires a response from the pupil, he makes a mark in the appropriate box on the answer page with a special felt-tip marker. If the correct response was chosen, a striped pattern is revealed, but if a wrong answer was selected no striped pattern appears in the box he has marked. Thus the child knows immediately if his response is correct or not. The Write-and-See system makes it possible for the teacher to evaluate each pupil's work by merely glancing at the response sheet and noting the number and kind of problems the child has had with the lesson. She is then in a position to decide what prescriptive action is appropriate to meet the particular needs of each child.

The level at which the child comes into the system is determined by a placement test. Each pupil in the program has a folder which stores his response sheets and a series of recording grids, one for each portion of the curriculum. The results of the placement test are entered on the proper grid, the results of each diagnostic test are indicated, and the score the pupil achieves for each lesson is recorded in the proper place on the scoring grid. It is thus possible to tell at a glance where the child should be working in the curriculum and how well he is doing. In addition, a weekly report is compiled to record the competence points each pupil has accumulated.

Each time a pupil has acquired 30 competence points he has his picture taken with a Polaroid camera and receives a color photo of himself.

To provide additional motivation for the children to advance to higher levels in the program, certificates of merit of increasing size are given to children as they progress from one level to another. There are, in all, eight such levels.

The Betti-Kit Materials

Much less elaborate than the New Century system, are the Betti-Kit materials that were used in P.S. 107 in Queens. They consist simply of special workbooks which are geared to be used with special tapes. The latter are played for an entire class on tape decks provided by the school. The children, seated at their desks in their regular classrooms, attempt to mark the correct answers in their workbooks. The teachers and aides go from desk to desk, make corrections and attempt to follow the progress of the children.

P.S. 207M

Located in P.S. 207, 41 West 117th Street, Manhattan is the teacher coordinator of the entire project as well as a part-time typist who serves as secretary and aids the program's coordinator in his work.

The Reading Laboratory at P.S. 207 is located in a bright, cheery room that houses 25 carrels. In charge of the operation here is an experienced reading teacher who has had more than 20 years of service in New York City schools. She is assisted by two full-time educational assistants. Participating in the program were 104 children coming from eight classes in grades four and five.

P.S. 208M

The second District 3 school in the program was P.S. 208 located at 25 West 111th Street. In this school 118 children in grades three, four, five, and six were aided in their efforts to improve their reading by one full-time teacher and two paraprofessionals. The teacher who was in charge of the Reading Laboratory has been at P.S. 208 for 5 years; this is her second year with the Reading Laboratory. One of the educational aides who assists her has been with the program for 3 years, while the second paraprofessional is completing her first year with the Reading Lab.

At P.S. 208 the Reading Laboratory is commodiously housed in two adjoining classrooms, both of which are well lighted and bright. In one of the rooms there are 32 carrels, each equipped with a headset and cassette player. In the second room there are additional cassette players, as well as chairs, desks and tables at which the children can work at specially assigned tasks under the supervision of a teacher or a paraprofessional.

P.S. 180M

At P.S. 180, 120th Street and Manhattan Avenue, 97 children from grades three, four, and five have participated in the school's special reading program. Here the Reading Laboratory, with 28 carrels, has been in operation since September, 1970 under the direction of the teacher who is presently in charge. She has had more than 25 years of teaching experience in New York City schools. She is assisted by one aide, who has been with the program since its inception in 1970.

A unique feature of the program in this school is that the participating pupils are not assigned to the Reading Laboratory periods on the basis of their classes of origin, but rather to periods in the Reading Lab that deal with the remediation of specific reading problems. Thus in a given period there may be third, fourth, and fifth graders in the Lab all of whom are receiving help in somewhat similar reading problems they might be having.

P.S. 107Q

The New Century system and materials were not in use at P.S. 107, Queens in District 25. In this school, six of the regular classroom teachers were assisted by three paraprofessionals, working within the normal classroom structure, to improve the reading skills of 122 children by means of Betti-Kits. As previously indicated, the Betti-Kit materials are simply tapes that are played for an entire class at one time while the children at their classroom desks use workbooks that have been devised to be used in conjunction with the tapes. The Betti-Kit program was in operation for the second year at P.S. 107. Project "Student Progress Reporter Corps" provided funds in this school only for the Betti-Kit materials ($4,800) and for the salaries of the three paraprofessionals ($15,200) associated with the program.

Facilities - Materials - Equipment

The school rooms housing the New Century carrels, equipment, and materials were in all cases bright, roomy, and cheerful so that a satisfactory learning climate was provided in the Reading Laboratories for the children of P.S. 180, 207, and 208 who participated in the program.

In these three schools the Reading Lab personnel stated that all of the required printed materials were available in ample supply at all times. The program thus did not suffer at any time from interruptions for lack of materials.

According to both the project's coordinator and the reading teachers in the individual schools, the hardware used in the program was well constructed and needed infrequent servicing. In the few instances when this was necessary, standby units were available, repairs were made promptly, and the original equipment was back in use without delay so that no inconvenience or disruption were encountered because of equipment failure.

In one of the schools, however, it was reported that the effectiveness of the New Century program was slightly marred because some of the answer sheets, apparently because of age, showed the correct response to the child even before the felt-tip marker was applied to the answer page.

Minor objections were also raised by a few of the teachers to the quality of some of the art work in the New Century materials. Some of the drawings, it was said, were not as clear and unambiguous as they might be and could thus confuse the child.

The audio quality of the New Century cassettes was judged to be good. It was noted, however, that it was unduly difficult at times - because of the quality of either the tapes or that of the playback equipment - to understand what was being said on the Betti-Kit tapes. It might also be reported that the general appearance and layout of the Betti-Kit workbooks were not particularly attractive.

Changes in the Program

In an addendum to State Umbrella Program, 1974-1975 involving the Students Progress Reporter Corps, the coordinator of the program on March 12, 1975 requested the following changes:

1. To reduce the number of participants from 1,000 to 484.

2. To delete P.S. 113 from the budget, because it is not being implemented at the present time.

The reasons cited in justification of the changes were:

1. It is necessary to reduce the number of participants due to the fact that this program previously included the participants of the Goddard Riverside Educational Camp Program which is now a separate program (Function # 20-53428) and also, due to the theft of materials and equipment at P.S. 113, the program has not been operating at that location.

2. Because of insufficient funds it has not been possible to replace stolen items.

The requested changes were duly approved by the appropriate officials of the City-Wide Umbrella Bureau, the Umbrella Supportive Bureau, the Office of Funded Programs, and the Division of Community School District Affairs.

Problems in Implementation of Program

The "Student Progress Reporter Corps" program, fortunately, was not afflicted with major problems of implementation. It should, however, be noted that, at P.S. 207, the installation of the carrels in the Reading Laboratory of that school was completed only in November, 1974. The full remedial reading program of the school, accordingly, got underway somewhat belatedly.

IV. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

The effectiveness of the program in the individual schools will be obvious from the following tables which present (a) the scores obtained by the children in the program in Spring 1974, (b) the scores that they were predicted to attain a year later, and (c) the scores they actually did obtain in April, 1975.

It is to be noted that for all four schools the number of children for whom both pre-treatment (MAT Reading Score for Spring 1974) and post-treatment (N.Y.C. Reading Comprehension) scores were available is smaller in each instance than the total number of children in the schools' special reading program.

Table 1

Pre-Test Means, Predicted Post-Test Means, and Actual Post-Test Means
(P.S. 107Q)

Grade	N	Pretest		Predicted Posttest		Actual Posttest		t
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
3	20	2.06	.19	2.47	.27	2.80	.34	4.814**
4	17	2.71	.39	3.13	.49	4.08	.95	4.807**
5	47	3.69	.66	4.22	.80	4.85	1.18	4.904**
6	20	5.05	.85	5.69	.98	5.58	.96	-0.532

*significant at .05 level

NOTE: The negative t value indicated that the Actual Posttest Mean was less than the Predicted Posttest Mean.

The actual mean reading score of the children in grades, three, four and five surpassed the predicted mean scores by three months, one year, and seven months, respectively. The children, accordingly, were either at or very close to the normal grade level.

Table 2

Pre-Test Means, Predicted Post-Test Means, and Actual Post-Test Means
(P.S. 180M)

		Pretest		Predicted Posttest		Actual Posttest		
Grade	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t
3	25	2.41	0.50	2.93	0.71	3.02	0.53	0.821
4	32	2.94	0.56	3.45	0.71	3.49	0.68	0.419
5	23	3.75	0.51	4.30	0.61	3.62	1.04	-2.709*

*significant at .05 level

NOTE: The negative t value indicated that the Actual Posttest mean was less than the Predicted Posttest mean.

The third grade children in this Reading Laboratory, the table indicates, slightly surpassed the predicted mean score, while the fourth graders equalled it, and the fifth graders fell somewhat short of it.

Table 3

Pre-Test Means, Predicted Post-Test Means, and Actual Post-Test Means
(P.S. 207M)

		Pretest		Predicted Posttest		Actual Posttest		
Grade	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t
4	45	2.44	0.56	2.81	0.70	3.00	0.60	2.060*
5	43	2.69	0.56	3.02	0.67	3.26	0.83	1.744

*significant at .05 level

The actual mean score of both grades surpassed their predicted mean scores by 2 months. In considering these scores it should be recalled that the Reading Lab at P.S. 207, because of the belated installation of its carrels, started to function only in November, 1974 rather than at the beginning of the school year.

Table 4

Pre-Test Means, Predicted Post-Test Means, and Actual Post-Test Means (P.S. 208M)

Grade	N	Pretest Mean	Pretest S.D.	Predicted Posttest Mean	Predicted Posttest S.D.	Actual Posttest Mean	Actual Posttest S.D.	t
3	26	1.96	0.76	2.12	0.23	2.07	0.47	-0.629
4	29	2.37	0.35	2.73	0.45	2.92	0.71	1.358
5	28	2.85	0.48	3.18	0.59	3.69	1.11	2.639*
6	26	3.75	0.88	4.18	1.02	4.35	0.99	.721

*significant at .05 level

NOTE: The negative t value indicated that the Actual Posttest mean was less than the Predicted Posttest mean.

In P.S. 208 the actual mean score of the pupils in the third grade was one month short of the predicted mean score, while the fourth and fifth graders surpassed their predicted mean scores by 2 and 5 months respectively.

To some degree, children participating in the program have shown progress considerably beyond that which would have been expected in the light of their achievement prior to enrollment in the program. This was particularly true at grades 3, 4 and 5 in P.S. 107Q, at the fourth grade level in P.S. 207M, and at the fifth grade level in P.S. 208M. Obtained results at P.S. 180M, however, were disappointing.

Motivation of the Pupil Participants

It was noted repeatedly by the evaluator that most of the children participating in the New Century program were anxious to get into the Reading Laboratories of their schools at the beginning of the class periods and many of them lingered on at the end of each period. They obviously enjoyed being there. Judging by the information elicited from the children during informal interviews that were held with them, it is clear that they liked their work and felt that they were profiting by their participation in the activities of the Reading Laboratory.

Questionnaires dealing with the motivation and attitude of the pupil toward school which were completed by principals and teachers indicated that the pupils who participated in the program seemed for the most part to be happy and relaxed. On the basis of the responses received, the following statements can be made:

1. Almost without exception, the children worked independently without undue attention.

2. After working in the program for even a short while the majority of the pupils felt confident of their ability to succeed.

3. Most took considerable pride in their work.

4. Probably because of the manner in which the program was designed and conducted frustration was found to be virtually non-existent.

5. Teacher assistance and help were eagerly sought when the children encountered difficulties they were unable to overcome by themselves.

6. There was virtually no inappropriate behavior in the reading classes.

7. The children were a highly attentive group.

8. They patently obtained a great deal of satisfaction from their work in the Reading Laboratory.

9. There was hardly anyone who did not participate enthusiastically in the activities of the Lab.

V. STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE PROGRAM

No major weaknesses were noted in the programs in effect in the three Manhattan schools using the New Century system.

The principals of the schools involved in the project were highly supportive and thus contributed to the success of the operation. The reading records at the coordinator's office as well as at the individual schools seem to be complete and in good order. The teachers as well as their assistants appear to be capable, dedicated to their task, and conscientious in the performance of their duties.

The New Century program is favorably viewed by school personnel for it is felt that it does help the children in the program to make considerable progress in the mastery of new reading skills. This is done at the child's own pace and without embarassment by possible failure in the presence of the child's peers or his teachers. Distractions, too, are largely eliminated by the manner in which the system has been designed. In addition, the motivation to succeed and advance to ever higher levels of reading accomplishment has been effectively incorporated into the program.

Teachers using the Betti-Kits were less pleased with these materials. It was reported that the interest of the children tended to fall off and the pupils seemed to become somewhat bored. The teachers at P.S. 107 were also of the opinion that their work would have been more effective had it been possible for them to devote more individual attention to the children in their reading classes.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is evident, on the basis of the available test data, observations and interviews with program personnel, that the program merits recycling. The following suggestions are offered for consideration.

1. It would be helpful if the teachers in charge of the Reading Laboratories could meet several times during the course of the school year to discuss the problems they encounter in the teaching of reading.

2. It is recommended that a more individualized approach be used in the future to either supplement or replace Betti-Kit materials.

3. It would be helpful in groups using the New Century system to develop some homework materials that the children could take home with them and there, in the after-school hours, reinforce the learning that has taken place at school earlier in the day.

4. Additional biographical material that is highly relevant to the children using the New Century program would be of considerably value in motivating children and thus assisting them to overcome their reading deficiencies.

5. The publishers of the New Century materials should be encouraged to improve the quality of some of the line drawings used in their materials. In some instances it is not at all certain precisely what is being shown in the pictures on the answer sheets and in the workbooks.

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Final Report
July, 1975

Function No. 20-53417

EVALUATION OF CITY-WIDE UMBRELLA PROGRAMS

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

1974 - 1975 SCHOOL YEAR

"CHILDREN LEARN TO READ THROUGH COOPERATIVE TEACHING OF PARAPROFESSIONALS AND TEACHERS"

Prepared by: Regis Bernhardt
and
Lillian Levine,
Research Assistant

I. INTRODUCTION

This program was designed to provide diagnostic and prescriptive reading instruction for six hundred children in P.S. 327. The target population included children in grades 3 through 6 who were reading below grade level as measured by standardized reading tests. The program provided materials for classroom reading instruction and for a reading laboratory, and paraprofessionals to staff the laboratory and to assist classroom teachers.

The program was originally begun in the school during the 1968-1969 school year. Throughout the period of time the program was in operation, paraprofessionals were provided to assist classroom teachers. The Open Court reading program was used to supplement the district-wide reading program. Findings from previous evaluations of the school's funded programs indicated that the Open Court program was more effective than the Basal Reading program by itself for children in the school. However, the staff found that children who had attained the fourth grade level in Open Court had difficulty with fifth grade Open Court materials. Houghton Mifflin materials were substituted for the latter at the suggestion of the reading resource teacher. During the 1974-1975 school year, materials in the Random House Systems were added as a supplement to the program. These materials were to be used as one element of the reading laboratory.

II. PROGRAM EVALUATION

The two objectives for the program as stated in the program proposal were:

1. The target population will demonstrate a significant increase beyond expectation in reading achievement as measured by the _Gilmore Oral Reading Test_.

2. Community paraprofessionals will demonstrate a level of adequate or better performance as measured by locally developed standards.

The _Gilmore Oral Reading Test_ was administered by program personnel to 150 target population children. Results of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests from April, 1974, were utilized as pretest scores for the other children receiving Umbrella Program services. The first group of children were those who received the Umbrella program services, while the second included those who also received Title I services. The _Gilmore Test_ was readministered by program personnel in May, 1975. Results of the City-wide achievement testing program were used as the posttest for the other group. Conversion tables, made available by the Office of Educational Evaluation, were used to enable a test of the statistical significance of differences between the City-wide test results. Comparisons between pretest and posttest results were made utilizing historical regression procedures wherever appropriate. The comparisons were between the Reading subtest of the _MAT_ and the Reading Comprehension subtest of the New York City Test.

To evaluate the second program objective, related to the performance of the paraprofessionals, a questionnaire based on local standards was developed. The questionnaire contained items concerning the services and functions performed by the paraprofessionals. Administrators and teachers who worked with the paraprofessionals were asked to complete the questionnaires rating the performance they had observed during the year. Paraprofessionals were asked to complete a questionnaire designed to obtain information concerning their perceptions of the program.

Observations were made of the classroom settings where paraprofessionals were assigned, and of reading lab sessions.

III. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

The principal of the school served as the program coordinator. In this role the principal was responsible for the administrative aspects of the program as well as for providing instructional leadership. Assistance in the latter responsibility was provided by the school's reading resource teacher, who coordinated the reading activities in the classrooms and reading lab. The classroom teachers who worked with the paraprofessionals and program materials were supported by tax-levy funds as were the above mentioned personnel.

Seven paraprofessionals were provided through the Umbrella program. Their assignment was on a full time basis, five and one half hours per day, five days per week. Five paraprofessionals were assigned to assist classroom teachers, while the remaining two were assigned to the reading lab.

The program provided a part-time secretary who worked at the school one day per week. She did not have specific duties but was used to give assistance wherever needed. This arrangement was followed because regular secretarial staff were utilized to service the program in areas best provided for by full-time personnel or when the program-supported secretary was not present. For example, the payroll secretary maintained the records for the paraprofessionals in order to provide continuity to the records on a daily rather than a weekly basis. The program-supported secretary, in turn, assisted the regular secretaries with their duties.

Several program changes from the original design occurred during the year. The principal of the school reported that, because of a decline in school enrollment and the number of children who received services from other funded programs in operation in the school, fewer than the intended 600 children received Umbrella Program services. A written program addendum had been filed with appropriate offices of the Central Board of Education which stated that 300 children were enrolled in the program. Of this number, 150 received Title I program services as well as Umbrella Program services.

The reading lab did not begin in the fall as had been planned. The principal stated that final approval of funding for the program was not obtained until the fall, and materials were ordered immediately after approval was granted. Materials essential to operation of the lab were received during the winter months. The lab began full operation the week of February 17. Orientation visits of the classes that utilized the lab were made during the two week period preceding the starting date. The purpose of these visits was to familiarize the teachers, paraprofessionals and children with the lab materials and procedures.

The paraprofessionals assigned to work with classroom teachers functioned in these settings from the beginning of the year. They assisted the teachers by providing opportunities for small group and individualized instruction in reading and related areas.

Prior to the time the lab became ready for operation, the two paraprofessionals assigned to work there were utilized for a variety of tasks. They administered the Gilmore Oral Reading Test to the target population children. As materials for the lab arrived, they prepared it for use, and the reading resource teacher used the time to train them in the use of the materials and equipment. As part of the training process, the principal, reading resource teacher, and paraprofessionals visited reading labs in other schools. The two paraprofessionals were also used in regular classroom settings at times.

The lab was located in two rooms in the school. One room housed software materials, while the other contained audio-visual equipment and materials.

Five classes came to the lab each day. One group of classes, which included children primarily receiving Umbrella Program services, was assigned to visit the lab on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. The other group of classes, which included children who also received services from Title I programs, attended the lab sessions on Tuesdays and Thursdays. The time of day the classes were scheduled to go to the lab varied so that the same group was not always first or last each day. Lab sessions were forty-five minutes in length. Teachers and paraprofessionals accompanied the classes to the lab and remained with the children during the lab period.

The principal reported that the reading resource teacher was very well qualified to assist in the program. Because of her training and her familiarity with the Random House system, it was not necessary to hire a consultant from the company to train teachers and paraprofessionals to work with the materials and equipment.

The teachers and paraprofessionals were asked to rate various aspects of the program. Ratings were obtained from both the reading laboratory and the classroom settings. Results of the rating process, presented in Table 1, were all at least "very good" (3.5 or above). Facilities, materials and equipment were stated to be suitable and sufficient. Supportive services of administrators and paraprofessionals as well as training provided to staff were rated high. Finally, benefits obtained by children in the areas of attitudes, behavior and learning, were all perceived as positive.

Table 1

Staff Ratings of Various Aspects of the Program

Areas	Lab (N=7) Mean	Lab (N=7) S.D.	Classroom (N=4) Mean	Classroom (N=4) S.D.
1. Suitability of physical facilities	4.57	.49	3.75	.43
2. Suitability of available materials	4.86	.35	3.75	.83
3. Availability of materials	4.57	.49	4.00	.71
4. Sufficiency of materials	4.43	.49	3.50	.50
5. Suitability of available equipment	4.71	.45	4.25	.43
6. Availability of equipment	4.57	.49	4.00	.71
7. Sufficiency of equipment	4.43	.49	3.75	.43
8. Supportive services provided by administrative personnel	4.86	.35	4.25	.43
9. Training provided	3.71	1.16	4.00	.71
10. Assistance of paraprofessionals	4.71	.45	4.75	.43
11. Positive effect on pupils' learning	4.33[a]	.47	4.50	.50
12. Positive effect on pupils' behavior	4.14	.35	4.50	.50
13. Positive effect on pupils' attitudes toward self	3.86	.64	4.50	.50
14. Positive effect on pupils' attitudes toward school	3.83[a]	.69	4.50	.50

[a] N=6 for these items; Note: Response Scale - 5=Excellent; 4=Very Good; 3=Fair; 2=Poor; 1=Very Poor

IV. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

As previously stated, the major program objective was that children would demonstrate a significant increase, beyond expectation, in reading achievement. The *Gilmore Oral Reading Test* was administered by program personnel to the 150 children who received Umbrella Program services in the Fall of 1974 and again in May, 1975. In addition, the Reading subtest score of the Metropolitan Achievement Test of April, 1974, was used as a pre-test score for all 300 program participants, and the April, 1975 Reading Comprehension subtest of the New York City Test was used as the posttest score. Historical regression procedures were utilized to determine predicted posttest scores for the participants. Conversion tables provided by the Office of Educational Evaluation were used to convert N.Y.C. Reading Comprehension Scores to MAT grade equivalents. Pretest and posttest means were compared on a grade-by-grade basis through use of a correlated *t* test.

Results of the comparison of the Gilmore Test scores are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Comparison of Predicted and Observed Posttest Means
of Program Participants on the *Gilmore Oral Reading Test*

		Pretest		Predicted Posttest		Observed Posttest		
Grade	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	*t*
3	63	3.19	1.77	3.74	2.20	4.70	2.24	4.20**
4	26	3.73	0.77	4.50	1.02	4.95	0.97	3.05**
5	18	4.16	1.15	4.75	1.37	6.26	1.78	5.48**

**p $<$ .01

The means of the observed posttest scores for the three grades on the Gilmore Test were significantly greater than the means of the predicted scores. The observed mean grade equivalent at the third grade level was one full year greater than the mean predicted grade equivalent. At the fifth grade level the observed mean grade equivalent was a year and five months greater than the mean predicted grade equivalent.

The predicted and observed posttest MAT scores of this same group of program participants were compared, and the results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

Comparison of Predicted and Observed Posttest Means
of Program Participants on the Metropolitan Achievement Test:
Umbrella Program Treatment Only

Grade	N	Pretest Mean	Pretest S.D.	Predicted Posttest Mean	Predicted Posttest S.D.	Observed Posttest Mean	Observed Posttest S.D.	t
3	63	2.85	1.23	3.57	1.72	2.91	0.73	-4.13**
4	26	2.78	0.55	3.25	0.68	3.46	0.51	1.63
5	19	3.36	0.76	3.82	0.91	4.68	1.00	6.14**

NOTE: The negative t value indicated that the observed posttest mean was less than the predicted posttest mean.

$^{**}p < .01$

The children's performance on the Metropolitan Achievement Test was not consistent with that on the Gilmore Test. While the observed posttest mean grade equivalent score of third grade children on the Gilmore Test far exceeded the predicted posttest mean, on the MAT, the observed means on posttest was significantly less than that predicted. At the fourth grade level no significant difference was found between the predicted and observed MAT posttest means. Performance of fifth grade children on the MAT was more consistent with the Gilmore than for the other two grades. The observed posttest mean was significantly greater than that predicted on both standardized tests.

Academic achievement of children who received Umbrella program reading laboratory services, but who received classroom services from Title I paraprofessionals, was also examined. Results of the comparison of their predicted and observed MAT posttest results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Comparison of Predicted and Observed Posttest Means
of Program Participants on the Metropolitan Achievement Test
and N.Y.C. Achievement Test: Umbrella Reading Lab Services

		Pretest		Predicted Posttest		Observed Posttest		
Grade	N	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	t
3	19	2.52	0.95	3.11	1.33	2.74	0.70	-1.60
4	26	2.25	0.49	2.56	0.63	2.63	0.58	0.50
5	23	2.50	0.47	2.79	0.57	2.90	0.56	0.94
6	73	3.36	0.80	3.72	0.92	4.96	1.26	9.65**

NOTE: The negative t value indicated that the observed posttest mean was less than the predicted posttest mean.

$^{**}p \leq .01$

With the exception of the third grade children, the observed posttest means exceeded those predicted. However, for only one group, the sixth grade, was the difference found to be statistically significant. The observed posttest mean of the third graders was less than that predicted, but the difference was not statistically significant.

To evaluate the program objective related to the performance of the paraprofessionals, a questionnaire which contained items concerning the services and functions performed by the paraprofessionals was completed by the teachers who worked with them. Paraprofessionals were also asked to complete a questionnaire designed to obtain information concerning their perceptions of the program as well as their perceptions concerning their own individual strengths and weaknesses.

Teachers were asked to indicate the percentage of time they and paraprofessionals spent in small group, large group and individualized instruction. Their responses are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Teachers' Estimates of Time They and Paraprofessionals Spent in Instructional Modes

Time Spent by Paras in:	0-10%	11-25%	26-40%	41-60%	61-75%	76-100%
a. small group instruction		1	2	2		
b. individualized instruction		2	3			
c. large group instruction		2	2			
Time Spent by Teachers in:	**0-10%**	**11-25%**	**26-40%**	**41-60%**	**61-75%**	**76-100%**
a. small group instruction		4		1		
b. individualized instruction		4		1		
c. large group instruction		1		2		2

Teachers estimated that paraprofessionals spent the majority of their time in small group and/or individualized instruction, while they themselves spent more time in large group instruction. These estimates are parallel with activities specified in the original program proposal. It was intended that paraprofessionals would work with small groups or individuals who need supplemental adult assistance.

Performance of the paraprofessionals was rated by teachers. These ratings are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6

Teacher Ratings of Services or Performance of Paraprofessionals

Statements	Ratings (N=6) Mean	S.D.
To what extent do you feel the paraprofessional:		
1. is trained to help you with:		
a. reading instruction in small groups?	4.67	0.47
b. reading instruction to individual children?	4.33	0.75
c. assistance in reading lab sessions?	4.67	0.47
2. is confident in her ability to approach and work with children?	4.33	0.75
3. considers herself a help to you in your work?	4.67	0.47
4. is clearly aware of her specific duties?	4.50	0.76
In our class situation:		
5. children are friendly and courteous to the paraprofessional.	4.83	0.37
6. children show confidence in the paraprofessional.	4.67	0.47
7. children ask paraprofessionals for assistance.	5.00	0.00
8. children accept directions of the paraprofessional.	4.83	0.37
9. the paraprofessional avoids overdomination of children.	4.67	0.47
10. children are given opportunities by the paraprofessional to show initiative and/or leadership.	3.80[a]	1.47[a]
11. the relationship between the paraprofessional and the teacher is friendly, cooperative, and confident.	4.83	0.37
12. the emotional climate is warm and positive.	5.00	0.00
13. grouping patterns vary for different activities.	4.67	0.47
14. attention is given to learnings of individual children as well as to total class and small groups.	4.50	0.50
15. the paraprofessional participates in children's functioning and learning activities.	4.50	0.50

[a] N=5 for this item

Note: Response Scale - 5=Excellent or Almost Always; 4=Good or Usually;
3=Fair or Occasionally; 2=Poor or Seldom;
1=Very Poor or Almost Never.

The program proposal specified that paraprofessionals should "demonstrate a level of adequate or better performance." A mean rating of 3.5 was accepted to be the minimum level of "adequate performance" in this report. Mean teacher ratings for all fifteen items exceeded this minimum level. Paraprofessionals were perceived to be well trained, to be confident in their abilities to assist teachers, and to be aware of their duties and responsibilities. The emotional climate was rated as excellent by all of the teachers who responded. This was also reflected in the items concerned with relationships between children and the paraprofessionals.

Paraprofessionals completed a questionnaire concerning the program and their own activities. They viewed their most important tasks as working with children who were having difficulties in school. Most of those who responded indicated that they had several years of experience as paraprofessionals either at P.S. 327K or other schools. They all felt that the program was beneficial to children and they did not make any specific recommendations for program improvement.

V. PROGRAM STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Several program strengths should be noted. The supplemental reading services provided by the program were well integrated with the regular reading program. The presence of the regular classroom teachers and paraprofessionals at the reading lab sessions enabled teachers to be familiar with reading difficulties diagnosed in the lab and to extend the treatments to the regular classroom.

Provision for secretarial assistance in the program was an excellent idea. Frequently "extra" programs in schools are adequately staffed from an instructional viewpoint, but the demands placed on supportive services, such as the secretaries, are often excessive.

One major program weakness was the failure to begin the lab program earlier in the year. It appears that the delay in initiating the program was beyond the control of school personnel. The program was not approved until the fall, and this resulted in a delay in ordering lab equipment and materials. The reading lab treatment aspect of the program will have been in effect for only two months when the City-wide achievement tests are administered in April. Some elements of the reading lab might have been implemented earlier in the school year.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are made:

1. The program appears to be providing services to a target population much in need of supplemental reading instruction. On the basis of the standardized test results it is felt that the program should be continued.

2. School personnel should examine program activities and services provided for third grade pupils. While results of the Gilmore Oral Reading Test indicated substantial gains in reading achievement for these children, similar results on the written achievement tests were not obtained. Performance on the New York City Reading Comprehension subtest was significantly less than predicted.

3. In planning for future years and in developing proposals for funded programs, the staffing needs of the school should be carefully assessed. The program was initially intended to service 600 children, but because of declining school enrollment and the fact that many children in the school receive services from other programs, the current target population numbers 300. Of this number, half are serviced by paraprofessionals funded under Title I but they attend the Reading Lab funded by Umbrella monies. This recommendation should not be interpreted to mean that the program should be discontinued, but that the school

should assess the needs of the children in view of services available. Children in the school, as previously stated, are in need of supplemental reading instruction.

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

Final Report
July, 1975

Function No. 20-53418

EVALUATION OF CITY-WIDE UMBRELLA PROGRAMS

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

1974 - 1975 SCHOOL YEAR

"DIAGNOSTIC-PRESCRIPTIVE READING SERVICES -

P.S. 40, QUEENS "

Prepared by: Linda Lyons

I. INTRODUCTION

In many instances, the early identification of pupils' academic and adjustment problems may forestall more severe disabilities. In order to meet the needs of pupils at the early elementary level, a program of Diagnostic-Prescriptive Reading Services was instituted at P.S. 40, Queens, to raise the reading and adjustment levels of approximately 300 eligible pupils in grades one through three. There were two program components. Instructional services in reading were to be provided by three teachers, who were funded under Title I monies, and six educational assistants. The teachers were to devise and implement an individualized program according to pupil need. Additionally, the teachers were to keep records of pupil progress, to provide in-service training for paraprofessionals, and to confer with classroom teachers, parents, and the administrative and guidance staff in order to evaluate pupil progress. The educational assistants were to assist with small-group instruction, testing, and record keeping, under the supervision of the teachers. Small groups of youngsters were to be scheduled for daily instructional sessions. To perform the many clerical duties in conjunction with the reading program, another educational assistant was to be assigned to maintain an inventory of teacher-made materials, as well as materials available in the Umbrella Resource Room. Under the second component, the guidance staff were to define specific areas of difficulty and to arrange for contacts with appropriate agencies in instances where pupils may demonstrate personal or school-related adjustment problems. A part-time psychologist was to administer tests, where these services were warranted, and to discuss recommendations with parents, teachers, the guidance staff, and the project coordinator. A team of medical consultants was to be available on a part-time basis, to evaluate problem areas and to consult with parents and teachers with regard to findings.

II. OBJECTIVES AND EVALUATION DESIGN

Program objectives, as stipulated in the proposal for funding, were twofold; (1) to identify, diagnose and treat learning and perceptual reading problems; and (2) to identify and diagnose school adjustment problems. The following evaluation procedures were employed:

(1) Observations were made of all aspects of the program, and interviews were held with the coordinator, the professional and paraprofessional staff, as well as a sampling of pupils.

(2) Metropolitan Achievement Test Scores in Reading were analyzed on a pre-and post-test basis. It was expected that pupil gains in reading during the course of the school year would exceed those shown prior to participation in the program.

(3) Pupil records were examined and evaluated at the end of the school year. It was expected that, for 80% of the

pupils referred for school adjustment difficulties, problems would be defined and initial contact made with an appropriate agency.

III. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Reading Component

The three laboratories functioned smoothly throughout the school year. Two laboratories each serviced a total of 55 second graders; one laboratory, a total of 65 third graders. The only change in instructional organization was made in the second grade laboratories; in March, 23 first graders were accommodated. Several first grade pupils were integrated within each of the second grade laboratory classes, and diagnostic measures were administered to assess pupil needs. Small groups of 9 to 13 youngsters were scheduled for four instructional sessions per week. In view of the fact that a teacher and two educational assistants were assigned to each laboratory, the staff-pupil ratio facilitated intensive remediation.

A variety of software was utilized to develop phonics, comprehension, and vocabulary skills. In addition to that noted in the Interim Report on this program, hardware equipment in use at the laboratories later in the school year included System 80 and Spell-binders. Many rexographed teacher-made materials were devised to reinforce specific skills. Additional software materials, as well as filmstrips and cassettes, were often borrowed from the resource room. The laboratories were organized to permit flexible pupil groupings. As a result, activities were devised on an individual or small group basis to remedy specific skill deficiences. During the spring semester, third graders were given reading materials, and were awarded certificates after having completed ten books. This activity appeared to be highly motivating to youngsters and tended to foster a positive attitude toward reading. Records of pupil activities were kept in individual folders. The staff planned prescriptive measures during daily preparation periods.

Continuity of services was maintained in several ways. Conferences with classroom teachers were held regularly, as well as informally, as the need arose. The laboratory staff conferred with the guidance counselor and psychologist, where further assessment of pupil needs was warranted. A workshop was held for second grade parents, during which pupil activities were discussed and demonstrations were given of materials in use at the laboratories. The educational assistant assigned to catalogue materials in the resource room has maintained an inventory of materials made available to personnel funded under the program. Additionally, this paraprofessional has assisted the guidance counselor by typing reports of pupil assessments.

Guidance component

The guidance counselor, who assumed this position in mid-November, has screened youngsters for special class placement or referrals to appropriate community agencies. The number of pupils referred to the guidance counselor for evaluation indicated a need for services far greater than was anticipated. After having conferred with the classroom teacher, and, where appropriate, the reading laboratory staff, the guidance counselor offered individual counseling and met with parents to discuss appropriate means of remedying pupils difficulties. Five workshops were held throughout the school year, to apprise parents of their role in helping youngsters with perceptual, reading, and adjustment difficulties. Attendance at these workshops increased substantially during the spring term, and the response was quite favorable.

Further, the guidance counselor has contacted various community agencies, in instances where pupils demonstrated problems which warranted medical treatment, social services, or counseling. Youngsters were referred to the Neighborhood Center, Queens Child Guidance Clinic, and the Bureau of Child Welfare, in instances where individual or family situations indicated a need for therapeutic measures. Youngsters with difficulties of a medical nature were referred to the Carter Community Health Center. Because pupils were treated for health problems at community agencies, the services of medical consultants were not required. Nonetheless, in many cases, agencies were slow to relay reports of medical or therapeutic services to the school.

The educational assistant assigned to this component, along with the guidance counselor, made home visits and often accompanied pupils to keep their appointments at various agencies. On occasion, the educational assistant also met with youngsters whose behavior warranted temporary removal from the classroom. This service enabled pupils who were momentarily upset to discuss their feelings with a sympathetic adult, and restored a favorable classroom atmosphere.

In instances where additional pupil assessment was warranted, the guidance counselor referred youngsters to the psychologist, who was available on a part-time basis. During the 1974-75 school year, the psychologist tested 42 pupils. Written reports were completed, which included results of various diagnostic tests, intellectual and personality assessments, and recommendations for special class placement, medical treatment, or other therapeutic measures. The psychologist conferred with teachers and parents with regard to the evaluation of individual needs.

To determine if participants had shown significant growth in reading, Metropolitan Achievement Tests were administered early in the program, as well as at the end of the school year. Because it was not possible to compute predicted post-test scores for first and second graders, data for these youngsters were analyzed on a pre- and post-test basis. These results are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1

Raw Scores for Participating Pupils in Grade 1

Metropolitan Achievement Tests in Reading-Primer Level

Sub-Test	N	Pre-Test Scores Mean	Pre-Test Scores SD	Post-Test Scores Mean	Post-Test Scores SD	t
Word Analysis	21	16.47	5.43	32.76	3.07	11.09**
Total Reading	21	17.62	3.31	25.62	3.49	8.37**

** significant at the .01 level

Table 2

Grade Equivalent Scores for Participating Pupils in Grade 2

Metropolitan Achievement Tests in Reading -- Primary I Level

		Pre-Test Scores		Post-Test Scores		
Sub-Test	N	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	t
Word Knowledge	88	1.60	.31	2.54	.78	13.09**
Word Analysis	85	1.51	.28	2.29	.82	9.78**
Reading	85	1.56	.23	2.70	.90	11.70**
Total Reading	85	1.61	.21	2.55	.69	14.33**

**significant at .01 level

Data indicated that gains on all reading sub-tests were significant. The program objective was met with regard to first and second grade pupils, who showed substantial growth in reading throughout the course of the school year.

For participants in grade three, it was possible to assess pupil growth in reading by utilizing the method of historical regression. Actual grade equivalent scores were compared with predicted scores, based on pupils' performance prior to placement in the program. These results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3

Grade Equivalent Scores For Participating Pupils in Grade 3

Metropolitan Achievement Tests in Reading--Elementary Level

		Pre-Test Scores		Predicted Post-Test		Actual Post Test		*t*
Sub-Test	N	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
Word Knowledge	49	2.51	.48	3.11	.67	2.30	.51	-7.09**
Reading	49	2.41	.50	2.98	.70	2.22	.48	-6.38**

**significant at .01 level

NOTE: The negative *t* value indicated that the Actual Posttest Mean was less than the Predicted Posttest Mean.

Results indicate that the reading scores obtained by third grade pupils following program participation did not exceed those expected on the basis of their past performance. Although prescriptive measures were devised and implemented for third graders, it became evident that many youngsters exhibited visual/perceptual difficulties which were not diagnosed until later in the school term. As a result, many third graders, despite intensive remediation showed no improvement.

Overall, when considering the performance of a majority of participants, substantial gains in reading were made. Personnel who staffed the reading laboratories instituted a flexible approach to meet pupil needs, and utilized a variety of materials to remedy specific weaknesses. Pupils appeared to be interested in completing various instructional tasks, and in developing basic skills. However, the performance of third graders was extremely disappointing and merits extensive review in order to determine if some program modification would be more effective in raising the reading level of these participants.

As an index of the effectiveness of the guidance component, records of agency referrals initiated by the guidance counselor throughout the course of the school year were examined. Results of these analyses are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Agency Referrals for Participating Pupils

Pupils referred to guidance counselor	113
Pupils who required agency intervention	83
Pupils referred to agencies	77
Area of Intervention[1]	
Testing/special class placement	35
Counseling	32
Medical assistance	26

[1] In some instances, pupils were referred to several agencies

Of the 113 pupils who were referred to the guidance counselor between November, 1974, and June, 1975, 83 youngsters were in need of further assistance provided by various community agencies.

The other 30 pupils met with the guidance counselor because of temporary emotional upset, and further action appeared to be unnecessary. Agency contact was made, then for 77 of the 83 pupils in need of these services. In view of the fact that initial contacts were made for 92.8% of those pupils whose adjustment level warranted intervention, it is evident that the objective of this program component was met. The guidance counselor and psychologist identified the specific problem areas of many youngsters, and made referrals to appropriate agencies for assistance to pupils in need of additional testing, counseling, or medical services.

IV. PROGRAM STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

Personnel who staffed the reading and guidance components constituted the greatest program strengths. The reading teachers devised and implemented prescriptive measures for participants on a small-group basis. The conscientious efforts of the guidance counselor who initiated and maintained contact with parents, as well as many community agencies, fostered a positive approach to the treatment of many pupils' personal and school -related problems. The only discernible weakness of the guidance component arose as the result of an unusually large case load. Consequently, it was not possible to offer counseling on an on-going basis to those youngsters who could derive considerable benefit from such sessions. Although the reading laboratories were effective in upgrading the skills of first and second graders, the program was not successful in meeting the needs of third grade pupils. The instructional approach utilized to remedy deficiencies of these pupils warrants re-examination.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The academic and adjustment levels of many pupils at P.S. 40 warrant continuation of the reading and guidance programs. These services are vitally important in order to resolve pupils' learning and adjustment problems.
2. It would be advantageous to administer standardized, diagnostic tests in reading to all participants early in the program. These measures would furnish more precise information with regard to individual skill weaknesses and pupil needs. Such diagnostic scores would be particularly valuable for third graders.
3. It would be helpful, as well, to examine all pupils initially for visual, perceptual, and hearing problems. Early identification of these disabilities and provision for treatment or compensatory measures might increase pupil performance throughout the course of the school year.
4. The services of medical consultants are not required. Pupils who need such service, can generally receive treatment for medical problems through appropriate community agencies.
5. The sizable number of pupils who demonstrate adjustment problems warrants expansion of the guidance staff. With the allocation of another guidance counselor, it would be possible to remove children from the classroom who are momentarily upset, to institute individual and group sessions for many pupils, and to maintain on-going communication with community agencies. It would be advantageous to allocate the services of another paraprofessional, to assist with home visits and to accompany pupils to various community agencies.

VI. SUMMARY

To raise the reading and adjustment levels of approximately 300 underachievers in grades one through three, a program of Diagnostic-Prescriptive Reading Services was instituted at P.S. 40, Queens. The reading component was comprised of three laboratories, each staffed by a teacher and two educational assistants. An individualized and small-group approach was devised according to pupil need. A variety of software was utilized in the laboratories; additional materials, as well as hardware equipment, were borrowed from the resource room to reinforce basic skills. An additional paraprofessional was allocated to catalogue and maintain materials. To ensure continuity of services, conferences were held with classroom teachers and the guidance staff, as the need arose. The guidance component, comprised of a part-time psychologist and a guidance counselor who were assisted by a paraprofessional, was instituted to evaluate the needs of many pupils. Home visits were made and five parent workshops were held by the guidance counselor during the school year. Many pupils were referred to agencies for counseling and medical assistance. Because pupils' physical needs were met by community agencies, the services of medical consultants were not required. For the first and second grade pupil participants, gains in reading were significant, which indicated that, overall, objectives of the reading component were met at these grade levels. Program objectives were not met at the third grade level. Initial contact was made with appropriate agencies for nearly all pupils in need of these services. Referrals indicated that the objective of the guidance component was met. Reading and guidance personnel constituted the greatest program strengths. Recommendations included program recycling and early administration of standardized, diagnostic measures in reading, as well as visual/perceptual tests.